Massimo Firpo and Germano Maifreda

The Heretic Who Saved the Church

Cardinal Giovanni Morone and the Origins of the Counter-Reformation

List of Illustrations

1. Girolamo Siciolante, *Portrait of Pope Julius III*, oil on canvas, c. 1553. Private collection.
2. Giacomo and Tommaso Cassignola, *Pope Paul IV*, marble, 1567. Rome, Santa Maria sopra Minerva. (Photo © Edr / Leemage / Mondadori Portfolio.)

3-4. Title page of the judgment of acquittal, with Giovanni Morone's coat of arms drawn on the reverse: a mulberry tree (*moro*) on a silver field. Private collection.

5. Medal commissioned by Giovanni Morone to celebrate his acquittal in 1560.
6. Bartolomeo Passarotti, *Portrait of Pope Pius V*, oil on canvas, c. 1567. Baltimore, Walters Art Museum. (Photo © Bridgeman Images / Mondadori Portfolio.)
7. Bartolomeo Passarotti, *Portrait of Pope Gregory XIII*, oil on canvas, 1572-75. Gotha, Schlossmuseum, Schloss Friedenstein. (Photo © Bildarchiv Foto Marburg / Bridgeman Images / Mondadori Portfolio.)
8. Bernardo Castello, *The Doge of Genoa Giacomo Durazzo Welcomes Cardinal Giovanni Morone, Who Arrived at the Port of Genoa in 1575 to Pacify the City*, fresco, c. 1600. Genoa, Museo di Sant'Agostino. (Photo © Edr / Leemage / Mondadori Portfolio.)
9. Scipione Pulzone, *Portrait of Giovanni Morone*, oil on canvas, c. 1579. Rome, Galleria Corsini. (Photo © Gallerie Nazionali d'Arte Antica / Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max Planck Institute for Art History. Reproduced by permission of the Ministry for Cultural Heritage and Activities.)

Introduction

1

In the memorable opening pages of his *History of the Council of Trent*, Paolo Sarpi presented the outcome of the long episcopal assembly as a perfect example of unintended consequences, since what had finally emerged from it was "a form and conclusion wholly contrary to the design of those who sought it and to the fears of those who did everything in their power to obstruct it." 1

> For this council, desired and sought by pious men in order to reunite the Church, which was beginning to divide, so firmly established the schism and hardened the opposing sides that it made their discord irreconcilable; managed by princes for the reform of the ecclesiastical order, it caused the greatest deformation seen since the Christian name has existed; hoped for by the bishops as a means of recovering episcopal authority, which had largely passed into the hands of the Roman pontiff alone, it made them lose that authority altogether, reducing them to even greater servitude; and, conversely, feared and avoided by the Roman court as an effective means of curbing its exorbitant power, which from small beginnings had by various stages grown to limitless excess, it established and confirmed that power so firmly over the part that remained subject to it that it had never been so great or so deeply rooted.

A paradoxical history, then, one that also fully encompasses the man who was its chief protagonist, Giovanni Morone. He served as papal legate both at the first, abortive convocation of 1542-43 and at the last, in 1562-63, when the foremost modern historian of that synod, the Silesian priest Hubert Jedin, credited him with saving it from the failure to which it had seemed destined. 2 Between those two convocations, however, Morone became the target of grave accusations of heresy, which culminated in the inquisitorial trial secretly prepared for years by Gian Pietro Carafa and formally opened in June 1555, immediately after Carafa's election as pope. The proceedings became public two years later with the sensational arrest of "so great a cardinal, [...] widely spoken of as certain to become pope," as Henry II of France put it. 3 Only the death of the inquisitor-pope enabled Morone to escape condemnation. And only the support of Philip II of Spain allowed him to leave Castel Sant'Angelo after twenty-seven months of imprisonment and take part in the conclave that elected Pius IV, his friend and fellow citizen, who a few weeks later, in early March 1560, pronounced his acquittal. 4 The paradox surrounding this illustrious prince of the Church, whose historical and historiographical profile has alternately faded into the image of a heretic "infected by Lutheran ideas" or of a "bulwark of the Catholic faith," 5 would endure in the years that followed, as shown by the attempt - prepared, though never carried out - by another inquisitor-pope, Pius V, to reopen the case. 6

For forty years the sword of Damocles wielded by the Holy Office continued to hang over Morone's head, even as he retained a political role of the highest importance. Between 1536 and 1555 he served repeatedly as nuncio in a Germany convulsed by the Reformation, of which he became the greatest expert in the Roman Curia; 7 he was legate in Bologna; 8 president of the council; 9 and a supremely skilful diplomat, whether in the negotiations for the alliance that would lead to the victory at Lepanto 10 or in the settlement of Genoa's political conflicts in 1575-76; 11 in 1576 he was once again papal legate at Regensburg. 12 To all this must be added, besides his continuous duties in the Curia, his pastoral commitment to the dioceses entrusted to him: Modena, teeming with heretics in the 1530s and 1540s; 13 Novara in the 1550s; 14 and Modena again in the 1560s, 15 although his unending diplomatic missions prevented him from residing there permanently. Yet until his death in 1580, this prince of the Church, rich in talent and experience, a friend of the Habsburg emperors, admired by the kings of France and Spain, and universally recognized as a man of exceptionally acute political insight and exemplary moral rectitude, had to contend with the ineradicable distrust caused by the accusations of heresy levelled against him. As late as 1576 the Venetian ambassador Paolo Tiepolo described him as "a lord of singular virtue and prudence and, above all, of great reason," esteemed by all the cardinals as "most intelligent and most weighty," yet ruled out his election to the papacy because he was among those who "have already tested their fortune on other occasions." 16

Despite his leading role in Roman politics for nearly half a century, despite the great success represented by the conclusion of the council, despite being "universally held to be a man of ability, understanding, and great experience in affairs of state, and by common consent regarded as one of the foremost members of the College," and despite an irreproachable private life, Morone continued in the

eyes of many to be a man investigated for offences against the faith who had escaped a deserved conviction by the narrowest of margins. The paradox can, however, be at least partly resolved if we consider that his political acumen, his ability to work with tireless tenacity, his irenicism, always bent on seeking solutions through negotiation and rational compromise, and his invariably lucid view of men and events, which made him an incomparable diplomat - in short, the ideological premises and personal qualities that enabled Morone to achieve decisive results in the service of the Holy See - were fundamentally the same qualities that led the inquisitors to judge him a man too willing to engage with his adversaries not to be their accomplice, or worse still, a stealthy spreader of the heretical contagion who had penetrated the highest ranks of the Church. The Church found in him a precious resource for navigating the dangerous currents of those decades, yet at the same time came within a single step of condemning him as a "corrupt, impenitent heretic or heresiarch," 17 just as it came close to raising him to the rank of Peter's successor and Christ's vicar on earth.

In a sense, these opposite potential outcomes are consistent with Morone's human and religious experience, in which light and shadow depend solely on the observer's perspective. His trial for heresy and his political achievements were two sides of the same coin, complementary aspects of a Catholicism compelled to negotiate with princes, sovereigns, and emperors who, even when aligned with the papal cause, inevitably pursued their own aims, confronted different historical realities, and defended their jurisdictional prerogatives. To address such problems it was not enough to threaten excommunications and the stake. It was necessary patiently to reconnect the threads of dialogue, to practise the art of the possible, to possess the tools and style of negotiation, to understand the limits of action, and to know how to read men's hearts and minds, not merely the inquisitors' manuals. It is therefore true that, in the end, Paul IV succeeded in winning his personal war against Morone by preventing him from ascending the papal throne. But it is equally true that Morone - in Rome as in Trent, in Ghent as in Vienna - kept the helm of the Church steady along a course that compelled religion to take account of politics and of the effective reality of things.

Morone himself constantly had to confront the tensions implicit in his double and at times conflicting loyalty: as a prince of the Church active on many fronts - from the nunciatures to the council - in defence of papal authority, and at the same time as a pro-imperial cardinal, indeed the undisputed leader of those in the Sacred College who acted in accordance with strategies converging with those of the Habsburg sovereigns. These strategies met in the search for an agreement with the Protestants: initially on doctrinal ground, through Contarini's formula of *duplex iustitia*, and later on disciplinary and liturgical ground, through the concession of marriage to priests and communion in both kinds to the laity. Hence Morone's frequent entanglement in difficult situations: at times because his Milanese birth, whether he wished it or not, made him a subject of Charles V and then of Philip II and instilled in him the characteristically Ambrosian vision of relations between secular and ecclesiastical power; at times because of the conflict, occasionally dramatic and approaching the point of rupture, between Paul III and the emperor over reforms of the Curia, the council and the aims it should pursue, its transfer to Bologna, the establishment of the Duchy of Parma and Piacenza, and the murder of Pier Luigi Farnese; at times during the outright war unleashed by Paul IV against the Habsburg rulers; and at times over the concessions to the Protestants agreed with Ferdinand I at Innsbruck in 1563 and fiercely opposed in Rome. This conflict was unavoidable, yet the Milanese cardinal knew how to face it with dignity and rigour, because in the way he experienced and interpreted it, that double loyalty could and should help to pursue common goals in the interests of the Church and the preservation of its unity.

Seen from these broader perspectives, Morone's biography offers an exemplary case of the turn taken by an entire generation of statesmen, believers, and men of culture whom the crisis of Renaissance Italy compelled to seek refuge beneath the wings of the ecclesiastical institution, which soon found itself engulfed by an equally dramatic crisis as a result of the Protestant challenge. Giovanni's father, Girolamo Morone, the grand chancellor of Milan, may be regarded as the very historical embodiment of the Machiavellian conflict between *virtù* and fortune that overwhelmed him in the wars for possession of the Lombard duchy, France's forbidden fruit. Likewise devoted to politics, his younger son had to take holy orders, becoming first a bishop and then, scarcely past the age of thirty, a cardinal, placing his talents at the service of the papacy. A man of uncommon intellectual and moral stature, he soon understood that politics alone was insufficient to meet the Protestant challenge and that some response also had to be found to its religious and theological demands. He went so far as to experience those demands personally and to pay an immense price for doing so: accusations of heresy, imprisonment, trials that dragged on for twenty years, and exclusion from the tiara, which he might

perhaps have worn with a political sagacity and religious foresight superior to those of every pope who occupied Peter's throne during the century. Charles V's support for his candidacy in the two conclaves of 1555 was of no avail, despite the almost unanimous judgment that he was a person "of most exemplary life, loved, esteemed, and judged most fit for this great administration by reason of his learning, prudence, and experience in public affairs." 18 Yet one may perhaps ask whether the highest price was not paid by the Church itself, upon which the convulsive history of those decades left profound marks, beginning with the long inquisitorial hegemony that for decades and centuries shaped its direction, its choices, its political and pastoral strategies, and its historical identity.

2

Played out entirely on an extraordinary public stage, Giovanni Morone's life has left historians with an elusive and at times contradictory image, from which it is not easy to reconstruct a clear and coherent profile. The countless documents that make it possible to trace his political role offer very few clues to his inner world or to the passions that stirred within it. His reserve prevents us from seeing much beyond his exceptionally acute intelligence and the prudence with which he knew how to exercise it. It is no coincidence that Paul III, who was a shrewd judge of men, while holding Morone in high esteem nicknamed him the "Well of Saint Patrick," meaning to imply that the cardinal was "a man, as they say, deep and guarded, and not easily fathomed." 19 Perceptive Spanish ambassadors such as Diego Hurtado de Mendoza and Luis de Requesens judged him respectively, in 1547, "a dissembler like the devil," and, in 1565, a double-dealing man "who never reveals what he holds in his breast." 20 Francisco Vargas likewise warned Philip II in 1561 against Morone's constant dissimulation, "as a man who knows well how to practise it," and advised that he be repaid in kind: a kind of prototype of the seventeenth-century "honest dissimulation" that would itself become an art of politics. 21-22 As late as 1574, a report on the Roman court described him as "crafty, artful, and deep," a man it was best not to trust too much. 23 Master Pasquino, for his part, called him a "deaf asp" hidden in the grass and a many-coloured "chameleon." 24

It therefore remains difficult to understand how, in this "man of deeds rather than words," 25 destined to be a statesman but instead becoming a churchman, the practical Lombard capacity for understanding and action could coexist, even briefly, with the refined spiritualism of the Spanish exile Juan de Valdés, who perhaps offered the most significant response formulated in Italy to the religious crisis of the sixteenth century. 26 In truth, despite the long duration of Morone's commitment to Church reform, his pro-imperial loyalty, and his friendship with Reginald Pole, it was for scarcely two years - between 1543 and 1544 - that he appeared genuinely involved in Valdesian currents, drawing from them the inspiration for pastoral choices that would first nourish the suspicions and later the accusations of the Holy Office. Some of those choices were imprudent, even astonishing in a man of such great political caution. Yet for that very reason they testify to the enthusiasm of his involvement, which to some appeared - and perhaps was - a kind of sudden conversion. Those months, however, would weigh on his life forever and determine his destiny.

In fact, as already suggested, the life of Morone - saviour of the Council of Trent and at the same time a heretic persecuted by the Holy Office - entangles the crucial knots of the history of the Church and of Italian religious life during those tumultuous decades. It clears the horizon of the far from innocent mythologies of the so-called Catholic Reformation, in which the Milanese cardinal has often been embalmed by historiography. His human and religious experience reflects, as in a mirror, the internal conflicts, tensions, plurality of choices and possible outcomes, and contradictions that emerged within the diseased body of the ecclesiastical institution when Luther's protest and the sack of Rome forced it to seek a way out of the abyss into which it had fallen. Since the long conciliar era of the early fifteenth century, a chorus of voices from every part of Europe had never ceased to demand the reform of the Church *in capite et in membris*, in head and members. 27 Such reform became all the more necessary as the abyss deepened under Alexander VI and the Medici popes, without the Fifth Lateran Council - summoned by Julius II only to counter the so-called Pisan conciliabulum - proving capable of changing practices and conduct that caused scandal everywhere. Distinguished theologians, bishops, and cardinals, prominent members of the mendicant orders, men of letters, and prophets who thundered from pulpits and inflamed public squares had all spoken out to insist on the need for changes that could no longer be postponed. Not only Girolamo Savonarola in the Florence where Lorenzo the Magnificent had sung that "whoever would be happy, let him be so," but also wandering hermits who hurled invectives and apocalyptic prophecies against the ecclesiastical hierarchy; "living saints" and "mother-

teachers" whose charisma reached great cities and small princely courts; and clerics and laypeople who eagerly embraced severe ascetic, eremitical, penitential, charitable, and welfare practices from which new religious orders and a new presence of the Church in the social fabric would emerge.

Rome, however, had remained deaf to all these voices, becoming ever more deeply involved in international high politics after Charles VIII's descent into Italy led France and Spain to fight to the death over Milan and Naples, in a struggle whose protagonists included Girolamo Morone, grand chancellor of Milan. Amid the shifting fortunes and "sudden reversals" of that conflict, papal families were driven by the very logic of an elective power that was as absolute as it was precarious to seize every opportunity to "make a state" for themselves, transforming their transient possession of the keys of heaven into an earthly settlement intended to endure. Hence the persistence of a tenacious anticlerical tradition expressed in many registers, from popular mockery to the literature of pasquinades, from the cutting irony of Niccolò Machiavelli to the bitter indignation of Francesco Guicciardini. 28 Nor can it be said that the old Paul III, that extraordinary political fox who finally resolved to convene the council, intended to launch vigorous reforms. To be effective, such reforms would have had to dismantle the system of ecclesiastical benefices and the gigantic financial machinery connected to it, in an inextricable tangle of simoniacal practices and abuses that nevertheless constituted the very foundations - the material bases, so to speak - of papal power and its entrenchment in the Italian peninsula. The popes themselves were the first to understand this, and they sought to limit, soften, and postpone those reforms. Pope Farnese did precisely that with consummate skill: in 1536 he established an authoritative commission *de emendanda Ecclesia*, but then failed to implement the measures it recommended. 29

The issue cannot, however, be reduced to the abstract theme of Church reform, because those who urged it most vigorously held anything but uniform ideas about its principal objectives, its instruments, or the structures through which it should be pursued. Nor could it have been otherwise in the face of the enormous challenges confronting the ecclesiastical body. The noble but wishful call to "reform men through religion, and not religion through men," made by Giles of Viterbo at the opening of the Fifth Lateran Council, 30 was very different from Gian Matteo Giberti's concrete work of reforming the diocese of Verona, to which he withdrew in 1527 after the collapse of his anti-Habsburg policy. 31 Different again from both was the grim reformism theorized by Gian Pietro Carafa. From the task entrusted to him by Clement VII of addressing the scandal of priestly ordinations in Venice, Carafa took the occasion in 1532 to send Rome a fiery "wretched memorial" in which he denounced the spread of "errors and [...] heresies" both "in the life and customs of some, such as failing to observe Lent and refusing confession," and "in the doctrine" of those "who speak publicly of these matters, uphold them, and also circulate prohibited books among others." Such errors and heresies were spread by "apostate" friars who had left their convents, against whom the bishop of Chieti hurled words of fire. His alarm at what was happening before his eyes became an appeal to act without further delay - "almost everywhere people are asleep" - and to adopt forceful measures to extinguish "so great a fire." "Heretics must be treated as heretics," he thundered, admonishing the pope himself to intervene "for the honour of God and in fulfilment of the duty of his office." "It seems that in a time of such necessity one ought not to proceed according to customary forms; just as, amid the gathering fury of war, new and appropriate measures are taken every day, so in the greater spiritual war one must not remain asleep," he concluded, linking the laxity and abuses of the clergy to the spread of the "plague of heresy," which he identified as the first enemy to be fought with ruthless severity. 32

Equally different, although not entirely without points of contact with the doctrinal premises of Giberti's reformism, was the programme of the so-called *spirituali*. Some of them too were active in their dioceses, as in the cases of Vittore Soranzo in Bergamo and Giovanni Morone himself in Modena. They grafted Valdesian doctrines onto Gasparo Contarini's irenicism, combining adherence to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone with the defence of the Church of Rome and its unity. 33 The success throughout Italy of the celebrated little book *The Benefit of Christ*, a kind of ground zero or first initiation into the teaching of the Spanish exile, demonstrates its ability to offer credible answers to widespread disorientation and to meet religious needs shared by many without imposing any ecclesiological rupture or the painful choices that might follow from it. This programme appeared all the more persuasive because it was embraced by figures of the highest prestige - cardinals, bishops, great aristocrats, noblewomen, renowned preachers, and men of letters - and because many regarded it as the only approach capable of overcoming the religious division of Christendom. In January 1547, however, the approval of the Tridentine decree on justification cut off at the root the illusory hope that the episcopal assembly might endorse a doctrine still open to compromise with the Protestants. The failure

of Pole's candidacy in the conclave of 1549-50 marked the definitive defeat of the *spirituali*, now deprived of a political strategy and exposed to accusations of heresy that Carafa had been preparing even before the establishment of the Roman Holy Office on 21 July 1542, the first step in the Inquisition's seizure of power, completed during the pontificate of Julius III. 34

It is therefore wholly misleading to insist on a supposed Catholic Reformation or "reform tendency" 35 broad enough to include Pole and Sadoleto, who were far from agreeing precisely on justification; the accused Morone and the inquisitor Michele Ghislieri, later Saint Pius V; the "good Matteo Giberti, glory and honour of the episcopal order" 36 and the stiff-necked Theatine Carafa, who never set foot in his dioceses. Vanquished and victors alike were undoubtedly animated by moral rigour and a desire to renew religious life, but they were also sharply divided over the aims of that renewal and the means by which it should be achieved. A reform open to dialogue with dissenters, prepared to accept some of their theological, liturgical, and disciplinary demands, founded on the pastoral initiative of bishops and on the restoration of Christian unity, was plainly the opposite of a reform aimed at strengthening ecclesiastical authority in defence of the strictest orthodoxy, even at the cost of turning a blind eye - or both eyes - to the ignorance and corruption of the clergy, provided that the primacy of theological rule and obedience remained unquestioned. It is of little use to lump everyone together, as the engravers of the *New Papal World Map*, published in Geneva in 1566, did in the heat of anti-papal polemic. In that image, bishops and cardinals were welcomed at the gates of hell by three hook-bearing devils whom the captions identified as Cardinals Carafa, Morone, and Pole. 37

Naturally, every demand for renewal, whatever its nature, met resistance from the stagnant mass of determined defenders of the status quo, clinging to the papal trough and unwilling to accept changes that would undermine their privileges and abuses. For that very reason, they quickly aligned themselves with the zealous guardians of orthodoxy. 38 Their support, passive though it may have been, nevertheless proved important when irreconcilable conflicts soon arose among the different aims and reforming strategies. These would ultimately emerge in the increasingly bitter political and religious confrontation between those who hoped for a reform intended above all to heal the schisms tearing Christendom apart and those who believed it should aim first and foremost at a vigorous struggle against the enemies of the faith. This was all the more so because in the 1540s heresies seemed to be spreading south of the Alps as well, where "this doctrine of the Gospel [...] is today being revealed and taught in many lands," as a religious exile wrote in 1549. 39 The clash between these different reforming currents - "the war among the saints," as it has been called 40 - ran beneath the surface throughout the 1540s, marking the stages in the rapid defeat of the *spirituali*, who were soon exposed to accusations of heresy, finally formalized in the 1550s in actual trials. Still latent under Paul III, the conflict enabled him to maintain a mediating position between the rival camps, relying now on one, now on the other, according to the political and religious circumstances. 41 Only after his death would the confrontation become open, in part because Julius III was too weak to stem the encroachment of the Holy Office. Yet the grim Carafa pontificate, which saw Morone's imprisonment and armed conflict between pope and emperor, was followed by that of Pius IV, who decreed the Milanese cardinal's acquittal and sent him to Trent as first president of the council, and then by that of Pius V, who prepared a sensational reopening of the trial.

This continual swing of the political and religious pendulum is itself evidence of the uncertainties and conflicts that marked the history of the Church in the decades during which the Counter-Reformation took shape. The term remains, in our view, a useful historical category, although it should perhaps be understood from a perspective different from the traditional one. The latter has chiefly emphasized the instruments of social control and intellectual repression deployed by the post-Tridentine Church in its war against heresy, while Catholic historiography from Pastor to Jedin has sought to contrast them with the independent reforming energies generated within the Church itself. In these pages, by contrast, we have proposed locating the origins of the Counter-Reformation not only, and not so much, in the struggle against a Protestant Reformation ultimately driven back beyond the Alps, but rather in the war waged by the zealots - armed with the formidable inquisitorial weapon they had succeeded in creating - against another Catholic reform, different from the one that would later be defined as such in the post-Tridentine age. The Counter-Reformation thus emerged from a conflict among the various currents of Catholic reform present within the Church. It cannot therefore be regarded as the coherent outcome of a long-standing process of renewal that the Lutheran protest merely rendered urgent. The events examined here, moreover, left a profound and lasting mark on the history of the Church in those decades. Little is gained by dissolving them into the mist of a generic,

all-embracing "early modern Catholicism" stripped of its conflicts and of its history itself, 42 and they can be explained just as poorly by the vague formula of pre-Tridentine theological *Unklarheit* that offered Jedin one of his many apologetic escape routes - as though the Roman Holy Office had waited for the conciliar decrees before opening investigations and pronouncing sentences.

3

When evoking the heresy trial brought by Paul IV against Reginald Pole, who was closely bound to Morone, the Silesian historian could do no better than retreat into a pained lament over what had happened. He called it "oppressive to think that a cardinal who, in the conclave of 1549, lacked only a single vote for a two-thirds majority," and with him Vittoria Colonna, "who until her death enjoyed the highest esteem of Pope Paul III and numerous cardinals, should only a few years later be branded with the reproach of heresy." 43 Ludwig von Pastor had done much the same when he recalled "with profound sorrow [...] that period of fear, distrust, and confusion, in which men who were in truth devoted to the Catholic faith with all their souls were artificially brought under suspicion of defecting from it." 44 What escaped both historians, however, was that by then the Holy Office had become the beating heart of the Roman Curia, capable of imposing the defence of orthodoxy as the principal task of a Church entrenched in the primacy of its hierarchy and in the strenuous defence of its jurisdictional privileges. It is not surprising that Morone should have appeared to them an embarrassing figure, a symbol of the lacerating conflicts that had divided the summit of an ecclesiastical hierarchy now restored to unity and eager to present itself as united in the past as well.

Jedin's portrait of the Milanese cardinal is therefore anything but convincing. He devoted only brief remarks to Morone's inquisitorial history before defining him as "an undoubtedly eminent but enigmatic man," while adding that "no one can deny that he was a sincere supporter and promoter of Catholic reform." Curious, not to say grotesque, is the further assertion that "the suspicions raised against him speak more in his favour than against him, because they demonstrate his openness to the religious ideas of his century." 45 Jedin's irrepressible need to rely on confessional categories, to draw a sharp line between truth and error, and invariably to see the action of the Holy Spirit in the history of the Church prevented him from grasping the complexity of a figure whom he projected solely onto the months of the conciliar legation of 1563, without attempting to historicize his human and religious experience. It was, admittedly, very difficult to establish the extent to which the Milanese cardinal had been involved in the heresies for which Paul IV would indict him without access to the trial records, whose first edition appeared only in the 1980s. The same applies to many other scholars. Among them was Gustave Constant, who, in reconstructing Morone's meeting with Ferdinand I at Innsbruck in May 1563, repeated Leopold von Ranke's judgment by presenting him as "one of the most experienced diplomats of an age that knew so many of them, one of those to whom the sixteenth-century papacy owes the greatest gratitude for their numerous services," 46 thereby implicitly absolving him of the inquisitorial accusations. Another was Federico Sclopis, who in the months preceding the opening of the First Vatican Council called him "a statesman, a churchman, a good man" at both the beginning and the end of a biographical sketch that nevertheless constitutes the first modern attempt to reconstruct his life. 47 Although he used categories such as State and Church that are ill suited to the political and institutional reality of the sixteenth century, the Turin jurist's judgment captured one of the defining features of Morone's life: his exceptional ability to mediate between the manifold demands of secular government and those arising from the processes of Church reform.

It is therefore no coincidence that until recent years there was no biography of Morone, even though Pastor had already stated the need for one and stressed that "the material is abundant," 48 while most studies devoted to him were limited - especially through editions of sources - to his final conciliar legation. 49 During the second half of the twentieth century, the cardinal's name constantly recurred in studies of the sixteenth-century religious crisis in Italy, but only in recent decades have specific investigations appeared. These begin with Susanna Peyronel's monograph on religious life in Modena during the first half of the sixteenth century and extend to the exhibition *The Man of the Council*, held in Trent in 2009, where the following year a conference focused on his role in the council's final phase. 50 The immense body of documentation concerning the cardinal, scattered across every corner of Europe - from Rome to Simancas, Saint Petersburg to London, Modena to Vienna, Milan to Mantua, Florence to Madrid, Venice to Parma - itself testifies to the importance of the role he played over the half-century following the sack of Rome. Thousands upon thousands of letters written by him or addressed to him, diplomatic correspondence, private letters, official acts of the Holy See, pastoral

interventions, notes, opinions, and instructions that remained unpublished for centuries have made it possible, in the pages that follow, to trace closely his tireless activity on many fronts: from European high politics to diocesan government; from the German nunciatures to the conciliar legations; from the government of Bologna to the Genoese crisis; from private and public financial affairs to the myriad tasks entrusted to him within congregations and commissions; and from the protection of religious orders and states to personal and patronage relationships. To these sources must be added the extraordinarily rich trial documentation, which has yielded not only a precious harvest of information on Morone's life but also new perspectives from which to view the history of the Church in which he was a protagonist. 51

The trial documents themselves, however, have been underestimated or at times ignored by scholars such as Thomas F. Mayer in his colourless biography of Reginald Pole 52 and Patrick A. Robinson, who, in reconstructing the Milanese cardinal's life, constantly assumes the role of court-appointed defence counsel intent on disproving the accusations of the Holy Office. That may perhaps be edifying for a devout Catholic today, but it is of little use to the historian seeking to understand a human story that cannot be reduced to conclusions as hasty as they are preconceived. Robinson argues, for example, that "Morone did not undergo a religious turning point through his encounter with Pole and his friends," but remained firm in a "soteriological perspective based on *duplex iustitia* rather than on justification by faith alone: closer to that of Contarini and Seripando than to that of Flaminio and Carnesecchi." This is maintained despite innumerable proofs to the contrary, which are dismissed on the unshakeable premise that "Morone's loyalty to the Church was too strong" to be contaminated by any heretical deviation, appearing as such only to the partisan and fanatical eyes of Pope Paul IV and Saint Pius V. 53 The subtitle of Robinson's book, *Between Council and Inquisition*, nevertheless highlights the unavoidable historical problem that anyone seeking to understand the Milanese cardinal and his leading role in the tormented period surrounding the Council of Trent must confront. Robinson addresses that problem from a narrow apologetic perspective, relegating the cardinal under investigation to the margins of the picture and placing at its centre instead the exemplary reforming prelate, whose model he supposedly helped to shape through the measures adopted by the council and "perhaps through his interaction with Borromeo in the early 1560s." 54 The result is a hagiographic portrait of Morone as the providential instrument of the Church's perennial "conciliar instinct" and therefore an undisputed protagonist of Jedin's Catholic Reformation, now expanded into John W. O'Malley's omnivorous, undifferentiated, centuries-long "early modern Catholicism," which embraces and encompasses everything. This faith-based instinct becomes an arbitrary historical explanation even when Robinson invokes a mysterious "instinct" among the *spirituali* never to leave the channel of Catholic orthodoxy, adducing as evidence ecumenical dialogue and the 1999 Joint Declaration of Catholics and Lutherans, supposedly demonstrating "the actual capacity of Lutheran and Catholic soteriology to find common ground." 55 Theology thus invades history, as it has always sought to do, this time casually replacing the inquisitorial rigours of the past with today's more or less innocent ecumenical latitudinarianism, and sweeping away in a single stroke centuries of condemnations, controversies, conflicts, executions at the stake, and massacres.

In five hurried pages of his plea for acquittal, the British scholar casts aside every philological scruple and endorses all of the cardinal's defensive arguments, even when contradicted by evidence and testimony. "To be suspected and to be suspect are not the same thing," he explains, before concluding that "it can be stated with certainty that by the mid-1540s the cardinal had developed a Christocentric religious perspective tending toward a soteriology that could easily be confused with the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone." 56 He thus throws a timely lifeline to the inquisitors as well, allowing that they had fallen into an understandable error. The whole affair, in short, becomes a misunderstanding, despite multiple and unequivocal testimonies to the contrary. What, in Robinson's judgment, cannot in any case be doubted - and rightly so - is Morone's loyalty to the Church of Rome, his total dedication to promoting "the reform and renewal of the Church and its unity under papal authority," and therefore his right to rise "into the firmament of the reformers." Convinced that he can see into the deepest recesses of the Milanese cardinal's soul, Robinson does not hesitate to assert that for him "loyalty to the Holy Roman Church was a Christian duty: God's Church was the only ship on which to embark, as he made clear in his *Apologia*," 57 that is, in the *confessio* written in 1557 at the beginning of the inquisitorial trial 58 - not least because, it should be remembered, had he written otherwise he would have signed his own death sentence.

Freed from the apologetic anxieties and the resulting dilemmas that have always tormented Catholic historiography in judging Morone, this book instead assigns a central role to his judicial ordeal. It seemed to us that, amid the inevitable fragmentation of the many political, religious, pastoral, and administrative issues in which he played a leading part, roughly from his first German nunciature in 1536 to his last in 1576, those accusations of heresy formed a red thread. They make it possible to reconstruct with a certain continuity and clarity the abrupt changes of course in papal policy over nearly half a century and seven pontificates: from Paul III to Gregory XIII, passing through Julius III, Marcellus II, Paul IV, Pius IV, and Pius V. Morone was not among those popes: he was the "heretical" cardinal and failed pope whose life condenses, as in a mirror, the history of the Church at one of its most dramatic moments, whose outcomes would shape its institutional reality, historical self-awareness, and pastoral practice down to the present day. 59

Our attempt to reconstruct and narrate that long and active life with care led us, almost without our noticing, to write a book of more than 1,000 pages: about as far from fashionable as one can imagine in today's historical culture, where the canonical Anglo-Saxon model of the 250- or 300-page monograph increasingly prevails, whether the subject is a small diocese or the Napoleonic age. An old-fashioned nineteenth-century tome, then, which - for all its many limitations - we ultimately came to like as it is: torrential, omnivorous, daunting. Only in this way were we able to allow the extraordinarily rich documentation mentioned above to speak and to take into account even the lesser or marginal questions in the biography of the Milanese cardinal, a life almost entirely absorbed in his public service to the Church. At the end of our research, it seems to us that the "Well of Saint Patrick" guarded his secret to the last, his most authentic character, still withheld - five centuries later - from the intrusive curiosity of our gaze. The Giovanni Morone presented by the sources remains, in essence, the political man, the public figure, the prelate wrapped in the purple robe that protects his human identity even as it epitomizes his historical role.

Acknowledgments

We have incurred innumerable debts of gratitude to the many people who assisted us in our research. It would be impossible to name them all, but first of all we cannot fail to thank Fulco Gallarati Scotti and Giovanna and Giorgio Moroni Stampa for the exquisite courtesy with which they allowed us to consult their family archives in their homes. Our warm thanks go to Letizia Arcangeli for information on the Milanese context of the Morone family; Luciano Cinelli OP and Giancarlo Palmerio for the information they provided on the basilica of Santa Maria sopra Minerva; Marco Iacovella for making available to us the many documents produced by his research in the archives of Mantua and Simancas; Rodolfo Savelli for reading the chapter on Genoa, offering essential advice, and allowing us to consult his catalogue of documents held in Saint Petersburg, which could not be accessed while this study was under way; and Andrea Del Col, Matteo Al Kalak, Gianni Romeo, and Giorgio Caravale for providing copies of Venetian, Modenese, Neapolitan, and Roman sources. Other documents were brought to our attention by Gigliola Fragnito, Sergio Pagano, Rossana Sacchi, and Maria Antonietta Visceglia. For the most varied reasons, we are grateful to Luca Addante, Cristina Andenna, Maria Luisa Betri, Dino Carpanetto, Francesca Coltrinari, Barbara Costa, Loris De Lion, Alejandro Mario Dieguez, Andrea Gasbarri, Francesca Gori, Dorota Gregorowicz, Gianmario Italiano, Simone Maghenzani, Stefania Pastore, Francesco Repishti, Edoardo Rossetti, Gaetano Sabatini, Renata Sabene, Matteo Sanfilippo, Giovanna Tonelli, Andrea Vanni, and Federico Zuliani. Dario Marcatto and Paolo Salvetto read and commented on an initial draft of the text, helping us improve its clarity, correct oversights and errors, and expand certain sections. Finally, we thank Andrea Bosco for welcoming this book into Einaudi's series and assisting its publication in every way, and Enrica Z. Merlo for her invaluable editorial work on the text. We also wish to clarify that several sections of the chapters that follow, especially those concerning the 1540s and 1550s, reproduce in whole or in part essays already published, with minor or major corrections, updates, cuts, and additions. The research incorporated into this volume benefited from funding for Projects of Significant National Interest (PRIN protocol 2015NA5XLZ).

Milan–Turin, November 2018
M.F., G.M.

Notes to the Introduction

1. PAOLO SARPI, *Istoria del concilio tridentino*, edited by Corrado Vivanti, 2 vols., Einaudi, Turin 1974, vol. I, p. 6.

2. HUBERT JEDIN, *La conclusione del concilio di Trento (1562-1563). Uno sguardo retrospettivo a quattro secoli di distanza*, Studium, Rome 1964, pp. 81 ff.

3. PM, vol. III, p. 164; see below, section XVI.1.

4. See below, pp. 533 ff.

5. MASSIMO FIRPO, "*Amorbato delle cose lutherane*" or "*fidei catholicae propugnator*"? Giovanni Morone between Inquisition and Council, in *L'uomo del concilio. Il cardinale Giovanni Morone tra Roma e Trento nell'età di Michelangelo*, exhibition catalogue, edited by Roberto Pancheri and Domenica Primerano, Comune di Trento - Museo storico diocesano, Trent 2009, pp. 17-45.

6. See below, chapter XXII.

7. See below, chapter II.

8. See below, chapter VIII.

9. See below, chapters V and XX.

10. See below, section XIV.2.

11. See below, chapter XXV.

12. See below, chapter XXVI.

13. See below, chapters IV and VII.

14. See below, chapter XI.

15. See below, section XXII.2.

16. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti al Senato*, series II, edited by Eugenio Albèri, 15 vols., Società editrice fiorentina, Florence 1838-63, vol. IV, pp. 225-26, 252.

17. See below, section XXII.1.

18. PASTOR, vol. VI, pp. 619-20; see PAOLO SIMONCELLI, *Il caso Reginald Pole. Eresia e santità nelle polemiche religiose del Cinquecento*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1977, p. 72.

19. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 764.

20. NB 1, vol. X, pp. 593-94; JOHANN J. J. VON DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und cultur-Geschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte*, 3 vols., G. J. Manz, Regensburg 1862-82, vol. I, p. 574.

21. SAG, Estado, 889, no. 85.

22. ROSARIO VILLARI, *Elogio della dissimulazione. La lotta politica nel Seicento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1987.

23. PASTOR, vol. IX, p. 875.

24. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, edited by Valerio Marucci, Antonio Marzo, and Angelo Romano, introduction by Giovanni Aquilecchia, 2 vols., Salerno, Rome 1983, vol. II, p. 756.

25. The definition is by PAOLO GIOVIO, *Lettere*, edited by Giuseppe Guido Ferrero, 2 vols., Istituto poligrafico dello Stato - Libreria dello Stato, Rome 1956-58, vol. II, p. 225.

26. See below, section V.2.

27. ELEONORA BELLIGNI, *Voci di riforma. "Renovatio" e concilio prima e dopo il Tridentino*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2018.

28. OTTAVIA NICCOLI, *Rinascimento anticlericale. Infamia, propaganda e satira in Italia tra Quattro e Cinquecento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2005.

29. See below, section II.1.

30. CLARE O'REILLY, "Without Councils we cannot be saved..." Giles of Viterbo Addresses the Fifth Lateran Council, in *Augustiniana*, XXVII (1977), pp. 166-204; on him, see JOHN W.

O'MALLEY, *Giles of Viterbo on Church and Reform. A Study in Renaissance Thought*, Brill, Leiden 1968.

31. ADRIANO PROSPERI, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma. Gian Matteo Giberti (1495-1543)*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2011.

32. CT, vol. XII, pp. 67-77, especially pp. 67-69; see ANDREA VANNI, *"Fare diligente inquisitione". Gian Pietro Carafa e le origini dei chierici regolari teatini*, Viella, Rome 2010.

33. See below, sections VI.4 and VII.1.

34. MASSIMO FIRPO, *La presa di potere dell'Inquisizione romana (1550-1553)*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2014.

35. THOMAS F. MAYER, *Reginald Pole Prince and Prophet*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000, pp. 175 ff.

36. ORTENSIO LANDO, *Paradossi, cioè sentenze fuor del comun parere*, edited by Antonio Corsaro, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2000, p. 130.

37. [JEAN-BAPTISTE TRENTO and PIERRE ESKRICH], *Mappe-monde nouvelle papistique. Histoire de la mappe-monde papistique, en laquelle est déclairé tout ce qui est contenu et pourtraict en la grande table ou carte de la mappe-monde* (Geneva, 1566), edited by Frank Lestringant and Alessandra Presa, Droz, Geneva 2009.

38. ALBERTO AUBERT, "Alle origini della Controriforma. Studi e problemi su Paolo IV," in *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, XXII (1986), pp. 303-55, especially pp. 318 ff.

39. PIER PAOLO VERGERIO, *Dodici trattatelli* [Basel, 1550], in *Biblioteca della Riforma italiana*, vols. I-II, Claudiana, Rome-Florence 1883, vol. I, p. 9.

40. T. F. MAYER, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 175 ff.

41. GIGLIOLA FRAGNITO, "Evangelismo e intransigenti nei difficili equilibri del pontificato farnesiano," in *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa*, XXV (1989), pp. 20-47, later in ID., *Cinquecento italiano. Religione, cultura e potere dal Rinascimento alla Controriforma*, edited by Elena Bonora and Miguel Gotor, il Mulino, Bologna 2011, pp. 188-220 (the edition cited here).

42. JOHN W. O'MALLEY, *Trento e dintorni. Per una nuova definizione del cattolicesimo nell'età moderna* [2000], edited by Marcello Fantoni, Bulzoni, Rome 2004; see JOHN BOSSY, *L'Occidente cristiano 1400-1700* [1987], Einaudi, Turin 1990; ROBERT S. MIOLA, *Early Modern Catholicism. An Anthology of Primary Sources*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2007; but see MASSIMO FIRPO, "Rethinking 'Catholic Reform' and 'Counter-Reformation': What Happened in Early Modern Catholicism - a View from Italy," in *Journal of Early Modern History*, XX (2016), pp. 293-314.

43. HUBERT JEDIN, "Il cardinal Pole e Vittoria Colonna," now in ID., *Chiesa della fede Chiesa della storia* [1966], Morcelliana, Brescia 1972, pp. 513-30, especially p. 524; see MASSIMO FIRPO, "Salvatore del concilio o eretico luterano? Giovanni Morone nella storiografia postridentina," in MICHELA CATTO and ADRIANO PROSPERI (eds.), *Trent and Beyond. The Council, Other Powers, Other Cultures*, Brepols, Turnhout 2016, pp. 243-65.

44. PASTOR, vol. VI, pp. 498-99.

45. See JEDIN, vol. IV/2, pp. 39-42.

46. GUSTAVE CONSTANT, *La Légation du Cardinal Morone près l'Empereur et le Concile de Trente, Avril-Décembre 1563*, Édouard Champion, Paris 1922, p. IX; see LEOPOLD VON RANKE, *Storia dei papi*, G. C. Sansoni, Florence 1965, p. 245: "The most capable cardinal and the most experienced in the art of politics."

47. FRÉDÉRIC SCLOPIS, *Le cardinal Jean Morone. Étude historique*, Durand et Pedone Lauriel, Paris 1869, pp. 1 and 86.

48. PASTOR, vol. IX, p. 165, note 4.

49. JOSEF ŠUSTA, *Die Römische Kurie und das Konzil von Trient unter Pius IV.*, 4 vols., Alfred Holder, Vienna 1904-14; G. CONSTANT, *La Légation*, cited above.

50. SUSANNA PEYRONEL RAMBALDI, *Speranze e crisi nel Cinquecento modenese. Tensioni religiose e vita cittadina ai tempi di Giovanni Morone*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 1979; *L'uomo del concilio*,

cited above; MASSIMO FIRPO and OTTAVIA NICCOLI (eds.), *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase del concilio di Trento*, il Mulino, Bologna 2010, pp. 225-56.

51. PM, vols. I-III; see also *Processi Carnesecchi*.

52. T. F. MAYER, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 133 ff.

53. ADAM PATRICK ROBINSON, *The Career of Cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509-1580). Between Council and Inquisition*, Ashgate, Farnham (Surrey) 2012, pp. 59 ff., 80-85.

54. Ibid., p. 227.

55. Ibid., p. 224.

56. Ibid., p. 218; see p. 83.

57. Ibid., pp. 216, 220.

58. See below, section XVI.2.

59. On the concept of the Counter-Reformation, see the perceptive survey by ELENA BONORA, "Il ritorno della Controriforma (e la Vergine del rosario di Guápulo)," in *Studi storici*, LVII (2016), pp. 267-95.

List of Abbreviations

ACDF - Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (Vatican City).

ACV - Archive of the (Arch)episcopal Curia.

AGB - Barnabite General Archives (Rome).

AISARS - Archive of the Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Saint Petersburg).

APSB - Provincial Archive of San Barnaba (Milan).

APUG - Archive of the Pontifical Gregorian University (Rome).

ASC - Municipal Historical Archive.

ASV - Vatican Secret Archives.

BAV - Vatican Apostolic Library.

BC - Municipal Library.

BgBC, Stella - Bergamo, Civic Library, Silvestri Archive, Stella Papers.

BoAS - Bologna, State Archives.

BoBA - Bologna, Archiginnasio Library.

BoBU - Bologna, University Library.

CSP, Mary - *Calendar of State Papers. Foreign Series of the Reign of Mary 1553-1558*, edited by William B. Turnhill, Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, London 1861.

CSP, Spain - *Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers relating to the Negociations between England and Spain*, 13 vols., Her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1862-1954.

CSP, Venice - *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy*, vol. VI, part II, 1556-1557, edited by Rawdon Brown, Longman & Trübner, London 1881; vol. VI, part III, 1557-1558, edited by Rawdon Brown, Longman & Trübner, London 1884; vol. VII, 1558-1580, edited by Rawdon Brown and Cavendish Bentinck, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, by Eyre and Spottiswoode, London 1890.

CT - *Concilium tridentinum. Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatuum nova collectio*, 19 vols., edited by the Societas Goerresiana, Herder, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1901-2001.

DBI - *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, Rome 1960 ff.

FiAS - Florence, State Archives.

JEDIN - HUBERT JEDIN, *Il concilio di Trento*, 4 vols., Morcelliana, Brescia 1973-81.

LANCILLOTTI - TOMMASINO DE' BIANCHI, known as LANCILLOTTI, *Cronaca modenese*, 12 vols., *Monumenti di storia patria delle provincie modenesi. Serie delle cronache*, vols. II-XIII, Fiaccadori, Parma 1862-84.

LuAMS - Lugano, Moroni Stampa Archive.

MaBNE - Madrid, National Library of Spain.

MiAGS - Milan, Gallarati Scotti Archive.

MiAS - Milan, State Archives.

MiBA - Milan, Ambrosian Library.

MnAS - Mantua, State Archives.

MoAC - Modena, Chapter Archive.

MoAS - Modena, State Archives.

MoBE - Modena, Estense Library.

NaAS - Naples, State Archives.

NaBN - Naples, National Library.

NB 1 - *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, First Series, 1533-1559, 17 vols., Niemeyer-Perthes-Bath, Tübingen-Gotha-Berlin 1892-1981.

NB 2 - *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, Second Series, 1560-1572, 8 vols., Carl Gerold's Sohn - Alfred Holder - Adolf Holzhausens Nachfolger, Böhlau, Vienna-Graz-Cologne-Leipzig 1897-1967.

NB 3 - *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, Third Series, 1572-1585, 10 vols., Bath-Niemeyer - De Gruyter, Berlin-Tübingen-Berlin 1894-2012.

NBM - FRANZ DITTRICH (ed.), *Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morones vom deutschen Königshofe 1539. 1540.*, Ferdinand Schöning, Paderborn 1882.

NBMR - FRANZ DITTRICH, "Die Nuntiaturberichte Giovanni Morones vom Reichstag zu Regensburg 1541," in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IV (1883), pp. 395-422, 618-73.

NG - *Acta nuntiaturae Gallicae. Publiés par la Faculté d'histoire ecclésiastique de l'Université Grégorienne et l'École française de Rome*, 13 vols., Université Grégorienne-de Boccard, Rome-Paris 1961-78.

NoAS - Novara, State Archives.

NoASD - Novara, Diocesan Historical Archive.

NV - *Nunziature di Venezia*, 19 vols., Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Rome 1958-2008.

OBL - Oxford, Bodleian Library.

PASTOR - LUDWIG VON PASTOR, *Storia dei papi dalla fine del medio evo*, 16 vols., Desclée & C., Rome 1910-55.

PM - MASSIMO FIRPO and DARIO MARCATTO, *Il processo inquisitoriale del cardinal Giovanni Morone. Nuova edizione critica*, 3 vols., Libreria editrice vaticana, Rome 2011-15.

POLE, Epistolae - *Epistolarum REGINALDI POLI sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinalis et aliorum ad ipsum*, edited by Angelo Maria Quirini, 5 vols., Ioannes Maria Rizzardi, Brixiae 1744-57.

PrAS - Parma, State Archives.

PrBP - Parma, Palatine Library.

PRO - Public Record Office (London).

Processi Davidico - MASSIMO FIRPO and DARIO MARCATTO, *I processi contro don Lorenzo Davidico. Edizione critica*, Archivio segreto vaticano, Vatican City 2011.

Processi Carnesecchi - MASSIMO FIRPO and DARIO MARCATTO, *I processi inquisitoriali di Pietro Carnesecchi (1557-1567). Edizione critica*, 2 vols., Archivio segreto vaticano, Vatican City 1998-2000.

Processi Soranzo - MASSIMO FIRPO and SERGIO PAGANO, *I processi inquisitoriali di Vittore Soranzo (1550-1558). Edizione critica*, 2 vols., Archivio segreto vaticano, Vatican City 2004.

RoAS - Rome, State Archives.

RoBN - Rome, National Library.

SAG - Simancas, General Archive.

TnAS - Trent, State Archives.

ToAS - Turin, State Archives.

VeAS - Venice, State Archives.

The Heretic Who Saved the Church

Chapter One

"I Abandoned All the Affairs of My Household": From the State to the Church

1. "A Man Memorable in Our Times": Girolamo Morone

Giovanni Morone's father, Girolamo, was born into a Milanese lineage "not [...] of extensive kinship," 1 descended from an urban class endowed with substantial landed property and a professional vocation in public affairs and the law. For centuries this class had remained aloof from seigneurial and military ambitions, marriages into the feudal aristocracy, and aspirations to titles or prelacies. The family had instead turned toward the proudly civic pursuits of commerce and government, consolidating this identity during the fifteenth-century transition that saw noble status become fixed and the mobility characteristic of Ambrosian society in the late Middle Ages come to an end. Giovanni Morone's ancestors (*de Moronis*, Moroni), who belonged to the Ghibelline party, had performed legal and notarial functions and, as early as the high communal period, had served as judges, consuls of justice, and councillors. Their genealogy traced its origins to a cavalry captain named Massimiliano, who was alive at the end of the thirteenth century. His son Girolamo fathered Giovanni, a notary and legal advocate who also served as councillor and ambassador to Pope Urban VI in 1386. 2 The cardinal's great-grandfather was Giovanni's son, the celebrated jurist Bartolomeo (1392-1461), who studied at Padua, Turin, and Pavia and practised law in Milan while serving the commune. 3 He was among the patricians who founded the Ambrosian Republic in 1447 after the death of Duke Filippo Maria Visconti, taking the office of keeper of the seals while the government continued the war against Venice and the claimants to the succession, including Francesco Sforza. When Sforza's siege forced the starving republicans to capitulate, Bartolomeo successfully re-entered political life and served as a councillor of justice under the Sforzas themselves.

From his youth Bartolomeo kept a Latin book of family records in which he personally noted private and public events, although it unfortunately breaks off in 1455. It shows that by 1424 he already owned property in the countryside around Niguarda, where that year he took refuge from the plague and where on other occasions he found rest in his country house, 4 in accordance with the humanist ideal of *otium*. His marriage in 1416 to Caterina Omodei - whose surname appeared in the fourteenth-century register of the nobility - also marked Bartolomeo's move from his father's house in the Porta Comasina district to what would become the family's permanent residence in the Porta Nuova quarter, a street that would later take the Morone name. During the fifteenth century his descendants contracted further marriages and godparent ties within the prosperous urban bourgeoisie and nobility - the Omodei themselves, the Oldani, and the Corio - with whom the cardinal's ancestors shared professional vocations, public offices, and extensive tax exemptions. The family also owed to Bartolomeo Morone the construction of a tomb in the principal chapel of Santa Maria della Scala. 5

Among the fifteen children born to Bartolomeo and Caterina Omodei, the most distinguished was the future cardinal's grandfather, another Giovanni. Born in 1431 and dead sometime after 1500, he served as chancellor from 1453 to 1467 and as secretary of the Sforza Council of Justice from 1478. 6 Alongside him and the jurist Giovanni Tommaso, who graduated in 1446, Bartolomeo's sons also included Paolo and Antonio, who became successful bankers. In 1450 Francesco Sforza entrusted their company with the general treasury of the duchy, facilitating its entry into European financial networks alongside the Panigarola, Rucellai, Strozzi, and Borromeo families. Their income was securely invested in Genoese and Venetian public debt and in real estate, including more than 280 *pertiche* of woodland at Cusago. 7 The Morones' social ascent among the leading Ambrosian merchants brought marriages, all within the city, to members of the Meravigli, Rabia, Bigli, and above all Toscani families, the last a wealthy banking dynasty related to the Borromeos. 8

The family into which Giovanni's father Girolamo Morone was born in 1470 thus possessed a firmly established pro-Sforza and Ghibelline identity, substantial wealth, influential kinship ties, access to the college of jurists, and to some of the most prestigious offices open to the civic patriciate. His mother Anna, daughter of Taddeo Fossati, must have played a far from insignificant role in the family's internal balance, since her wealthy nephew Filippo, heir to the banker Antonio, bequeathed his share of the Milanese palace and its furnishings, as well as the house at Niguarda, to her rather than to his uncle Giacomo. 9 Girolamo was not the eldest son: in 1495 his brother Giovanni Tommaso inherited their father's office of chancellor, while other brothers pursued ecclesiastical careers. Taddeo became a canon of the cathedral in 1494, and Giovanni Bartolomeo entered the Augustinian order at Santa Maria Incoronata. Girolamo was introduced to Greek and Latin letters by Demetrios Chalkokondyles and Alessandro Minuziano, both active at the Sforza court. He received an excellent education and in 1497 took a doctorate *in utroque iure* at Pavia, where renowned jurists such as Lancillotto Decio, Giasone del Maino, and Raffaello Adorno were teaching. 10 His uncommon intellectual gifts were also recognized by Francesco Guicciardini, who in the *History of Italy* etched a darkly vivid portrait of him, presenting him as "for intelligence, eloquence, readiness, inventiveness, and experience [...] a man memorable in our times," who would have been still more memorable "had these gifts been accompanied by a more sincere spirit, a greater love of honesty, and such maturity of judgment that his counsels had not so often been rash or shameless rather than honourable or circumspect." 11

Girolamo Morone's life appeared set to follow the family's ancient legal tradition when the long period of peace enjoyed by the peninsula was shattered by the descent of Charles VIII, which began a succession of conflicts that ended only in 1559 and were destined to transform Italian history and political geography forever. 12 Giovanni's father was among the protagonists of the mobilization of leading citizens and common people that followed Ludovico il Moro's departure on 31 August 1499 and, according to his own account, drafted the articles presented by the city to the new French sovereign, Louis XII. 13 Despite the family's long-standing pro-Sforza tradition, he took no part in the Milanese uprising of January 1500 in support of Il Moro's return, nor did he collaborate with him during the brief restoration that followed. 14 Appointed the city's procurator when the king of France returned, Morone established contacts with the royal council and obtained important and lucrative offices. He served as fiscal advocate and as one of the Twelve of Provision, in the capacity of lieutenant to the vicar, before becoming a member of the Senate in 1507. This was one of the most important organs of government, established by the new sovereign on the model of the French parlements in place of the Secret Council and the Council of Justice. 15 The appointment, then held for life, confirmed his entry into the governing elite, although within the order of robe senators, whose functions and salary differed from those of the feudally derived *milites* and prelates. In this capacity he undertook intense diplomatic activity among the Swiss cantons between 1503 and 1507, in Florence in 1508 or 1509, and again in Swiss territory and Mantua in 1511.

During the French years Girolamo's family prospered, by then established in the residence of San Martino, of which unfortunately no trace survives. His marriage in 1501 to the Lodi aristocrat Amabilia Fissiraga created a family connection with the illustrious dynasty of "gentlemen of Lombardy" 16 that bore that name. In terms of lordly stature, antiquity, and dignity, the Fissiraga stood far above the Morones, and the marriage allowed Girolamo to climb another rung in the fluid political and social hierarchy of the French period. Amabilia was the daughter of Antonio and Elena Cadamosto, as well as the widow of the jurist Bassano Cadamosto, whom Ludovico il Moro had previously appointed among the civic councillors of the Guelph party in Lodi during the reform of 1492. 17 Their extensive feudal holdings centred on Cavenago d'Adda and had been accumulated since the thirteenth century, when the Fissiraga distinguished themselves by their loyalty to the Apostolic See and their support for the mendicant orders. In the early fourteenth century Antonio Fissiraga had become the Guelph lord of Lodi and the bitter enemy of Matteo Visconti, who imprisoned him in Milan for fifteen years, from 1312 until his death. 18 Amabilia was wealthy, but her dowry amounted to only 3,000 ducats, a relatively modest sum that perhaps reflects the cool reception given to Girolamo by the illustrious Lodi lineage. Even so, it was twice the sum he would receive two years later as his one-third share of his father's inheritance. Until 1507, as fiscal advocate, he received an annual salary of 400 livres tournois, which rose to 600 when he was appointed senator, equivalent to about 375 ducats. 19

The family's new economic stability was accompanied by the birth of numerous children. The first was Giovangirolamo, 20 whose death at an uncertain date around 1520 transferred the status of firstborn to Giovanni Antonio, usually called Antonio after his maternal grandfather, who was probably born in

1502. 21 He was followed in 1509 by Giovanni, whose second name was also Girolamo, 22 shortly before his father's appointment as podestà of Brescia. 23 The youngest son was Sforza, probably born around 1522. 24 After Antonio's death and Giovanni's ecclesiastical vows, he would become Count of Pontecurone and owner of the Milanese palace and the family's properties in Lombardy. On his death in 1578, these would pass to his son Girolamo, who two years later also became the universal heir of his uncle Giovanni. 25 Girolamo also had at least six daughters, almost all of whom married scions of influential families. The steadily rising quality of their marriages is itself an indication of the increasingly prominent position their father attained in Milan during the first fifteen years of the century.

The eldest daughter was probably Susanna, born out of wedlock and soon married to a certain Giorgio Corio, a relatively minor member of the family of Sforza humanists led by Bernardino, whom Girolamo recommended in 1518

to the president of the Senate, calling him his "dear son-in-law." 26 Chiara (perhaps also illegitimate, although she was not mentioned in her father's will of 1516) 27 married Alessandro Visconti, a descendant of a natural son of Bernabò, while Angela married Adalberto Pallavicino, marquis of Busseto, captain-general of the Venetian troops and the author of important improvements in his imperial fief, including a new canal diverted from the River Oglio beginning in 1525. 28 By marrying Catalano Gallarati, Amabilia Morone instead entered the ancient pro-Sforza feudal family of the Gallarati of Desio and Piola. In 1524 her husband was assessed as having an income of 20,000 ducats, not far short of the 32,000 attributed to Girolamo Morone on the same occasion. In the middle of the century he inherited the sumptuous palace near the Castle, but his fortunes declined because of debt and then because of his involvement in a pro-imperial conspiracy in Bologna in 1548. 29 After transferring the duties and revenues of the lordship of Cerano to a collateral relative, he was forced to sell the ancestral palace and in 1571 move to the far from prestigious parish of San Simpliciano at Porta Comasina. 30 Eleonora met with a not very different fate. In 1524 she married, as her first husband, Girolamo Botta, whose father Bergonzio, a wealthy administrator of the ducal finances, had been a leading figure at the Sforza court under Ludovico il Moro before coming to terms with the French. 31 The young Botta died prematurely in 1536, and Eleonora had to sell for 10,000 imperial lire - the amount of her dowry - the fief of Fortunago, which her father-in-law had purchased in 1487. 32 In 1541 their son Bergonzio would accompany his uncle on the nunciature in Germany, where he would live for a long time, before returning to Italy and spending a couple of years at Margaret of Austria's court in Abruzzo thanks to his kinship with the cardinal. 33 In 1576 he would once again accompany his uncle to the Diet of Regensburg. Three years later Morone warmly recommended him to the duke of Ferrara as the duke's resident in Milan, describing him as "a gentleman of good standing who speaks excellent German, French, and Spanish." 34 Having married Giovan Francesco Vialardi as her second husband, Eleonora Morone would be the longest-lived of Girolamo Morone's daughters. Anna, who referred to her in her will as her "only and most beloved sister," would leave her a life annuity of 3,500 lire a year, together with a residence in Milan, some furniture, precious tapestries, a coach and horses, three brente of white wine and six of "the finest" red wine each year, produced on the Stampa estates at Grezzago. 35

Born in 1507, Anna Morone married the rich and powerful Count Massimiliano Stampa in 1529. He was Francesco II Sforza's foster brother and loyal servant, also serving as castellan, and in 1536 was granted the marquisate of Soncino for handing Milan's military forces over to Charles V after the death of the last duke. Anna was well established at the court of the governor of Milan, Alfonso d'Avalos, and especially in the household of his wife, Maria of Aragon, whom she saw constantly during Maria's stay in Lombardy. There Luca Contile praised her "fine judgment in words full of wit, grace, and wisdom," 36 while Ludovico Domenichi celebrated her reputation as a "most valiant woman of excellent judgment," together with "Leonora Morona Botta and the lady Amabilia Morona Galerata, both truly adorned with virtuous beauty and very gracious and accomplished." 37 Difficult times nevertheless came for the Stampa as well after the death of the last duke, Francesco II Sforza, when Massimiliano withdrew from public life to deal with a difficult succession caused by the death of his only son Francesco in 1528. He himself died prematurely in 1552, leaving Anna - who would survive until 1587 38 - the usufruct of his revenues and palaces and ownership of everything they contained. Regarded as a "virago" by the Florentine resident Paolo Vinta, 39 she honoured her husband with a sumptuous funeral and insisted that his descendants adopt the surname Morone Stampa. Girolamo Morone, the eldest son and heir of Sforza Morone, would do the same, combining it with the coat of arms designed by his aunt, which quartered the arms of the two houses. 40 Anna Morone's prudent administrative abilities are also shown by the fact that for years she managed her cardinal brother's Milanese properties. 41 Her forceful temperament would emerge during his agonizing imprisonment, when she devoted herself body and soul to securing his release; afterwards she had herself portrayed with him on a proud commemorative medal. 42 Yet even in less dramatic circumstances she showed the same resolve. In the autumn of 1556, in order to defend her hereditary rights over the jurisdiction of Cusago, Girolamo Morone's childless widowed daughter did not hesitate to write directly to Charles V, bypassing Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, then governor of Milan. Madruzzo was forced to consult the Magistrato Straordinario for information about the dispute and report it to the new king of Spain, Philip II. 43

2. Amid the "Horrendous Wars" of Italy

Giovanni Morone spent his childhood without being able to see his father regularly. Girolamo's growing political responsibilities, amid a tumultuous succession of events, prevented the family from

living together for many years. The turbulent events of the 1520s marked out the course his life would follow: his studies in Padua, the vicissitudes of war, his first contacts with and then entry into the papal Curia, where the Sack of 1527 would extinguish the splendours of the Renaissance but not the possibility of forming lasting relationships, his appointment first as bishop of Tortona and then of Modena, Clement VII's insight in recognizing him as the heir to his father's talent, and Girolamo's own death on 15 December 1529. These were the decisive moments in an all too precocious political education, yet one from which extraordinary fruit would ripen.

Beginning in 1512, the victories of the Holy League promoted by Pope Julius II under the slogan "Out with the barbarians" allowed the troops of the Swiss cantons to intervene against the French in the Milanese, take control of the duchy, and place it under the rule of Ludovico il Moro's weak eldest son. This was the young Ercole who, out of gratitude to Emperor Maximilian, who had protected him after his father's fall, had adopted the emperor's name. Although he had served the Valois, Girolamo Morone managed to obtain important offices during the three years of restored Sforza rule. He coordinated foreign policy and extraordinary taxation and was eventually appointed conservator of the state. 44 Between 1513 and 1515 Sforza repeatedly employed his diplomatic acumen on missions to Rome, where he was considered indispensable for his "great intelligence and experience" in supporting the Milanese resident Marino Caracciolo. His consummate ability to serve rulers and princes already arrayed on opposing sides brought the family new honours and benefices as well as further wealth, which was also invested in vineyards along the Adda. 45 In November 1513 the head of the family received the title of count from Duke Massimiliano; in 1524 he was invested with the county of Lecco, to which Francesco II Sforza would add Orio in the Lodigiano. Morone's possession of the Lecco territory was recognized both by the French in 1515 and by the imperial authorities in 1527.

The fortunes and prestige of the Morone continued to grow, seemingly impervious to wars and peaces that brought with them lords, armies, coins from beyond the Alps, and languages that most people could barely pronounce. Yet despite Girolamo's skill, the fate of the house and family remained exposed to the threat of continual political upheaval. This became clear after Marignano and Sforza's exile, when in October 1515 he had to bring his wife and children, including the young Giovanni, back into the city by water from their refuge near Bellinzona during the fighting. 46 A period of anxiety and uncertainty then began for them, lasting until the Peace of Noyon in August 1516. The eldest son, Giovangirolamo, was captured while serving Massimiliano's captain-general, Prospero Colonna, and was held for many months at Carmagnola. 47 His father, in turn, escaped an assassination attempt that led him to withdraw to the castle of Sorli in the Tortonese, 48 which was restored to him, together with his son Sforza, only after lengthy negotiations. From there, hoping to join the Milanese exiles at Trent, he went to Modena, which the pope had taken from the Este and where Francesco Guicciardini had been installed as papal commissioner in June 1516. Girolamo remained there until August 1518, while his property in Milan was confiscated, and left behind a reputation as "a very famous man of great standing." 49 He finally reached the principality of Trent and entered the following of Francesco II Sforza, who was there to coordinate the exiles and succeed his brother as ruler of Milan. He would not return to the Ambrosian duchy until 1521, in the train of the troops of Pope Leo X and Emperor Charles V.

It was against the background of the dramatic events of 1516 that Girolamo Morone and his wife had their wills drawn up by the Milanese notary Gian Pietro Carcano, on 16 and 20 March respectively. 50 In his last wishes - later superseded by another, now lost, will drawn up in Naples in 1528-29 - the head of the family named his sons Giovangirolamo, who would soon die, Antonio, and Giovanni as universal heirs to his property; his fourth son, Sforza, had not yet been born. He nevertheless granted the usufruct to his wife Amabilia. He assigned each of his four legitimate daughters, Anna, Eleonora, Amabilia, and Angela, a dowry of 8,000 lire and an annual income of 200 lire. He also provided a dowry of 2,400 lire and an annual income of 120 lire for his legitimized daughter Susanna, allowing her to live wherever she wished, either in a family house or in a convent. He further ordered that Ludovico Morone, the natural son of his brother Tommaso, should be housed by a member of the family and provided with an annual income of 100 lire. He then listed the customary legacies for servants, sometimes in the form of forgiven debts. He also obliged his heirs to give 200 lire to the parish of San Martino di Nosiggia and to endow it with a chapel dedicated to the Virgin and Saints Jerome and Catherine. He set aside 800 lire for its construction and another 800 for a marble tomb "with its ornaments." A daily requiem mass was to be celebrated there, supported by an annual endowment of 62 lire drawn from rents at Rovederio in the Lodigiano, with his wife choosing the chaplain. He also established requiem masses for his parents in

the family church of Santa Maria della Scala, likewise endowed with an income of 62 lire. Finally, he fixed the cost of his funeral at eighteen lire, a fairly modest sum. For her part, Amabilia Fissiraga mentioned the three daughters of her first marriage and the four she had borne to Girolamo Morone - Anna, Eleonora, Amabilia, and Angela, already mentioned. She named her three sons as heirs to her property, to be divided equally, while granting her husband the usufruct.

The warm welcome Girolamo Morone received among the nobles and patricians who governed Modena did not soothe his anxiety about the future of his children. In May 1516 he wrote to Francesco II Sforza that leaving his wife and children behind in Milan clearly proved that his slanderers lied when they accused him of placing his own interests above the duke's dignity and service. He repeatedly asked his friend, the commander Galeazzo Visconti, to look after the family's affairs, 51 and relied even more on his devoted cousin, the Milanese senator Giovanni Angelo Salvatico, who may for a time have housed the young Giovanni in his Milanese palace. 52 Besides protecting his children physically, Girolamo always took great care over their education. His two younger sons, Antonio and Giovanni, were again taken with their tutor to Bellinzona under the protection of the prior of Blenio, while the eldest, Giovangirolamo, remained in Prospero Colonna's following at his father's insistence. 53 A few years later Ortensio Lando would set his Cicero relegatus, written around 1531 and published in 1533, in Bellinzona. In its second part Giovanni Morone and Ermes Stampa - born two years before him, brother of his future brother-in-law Massimiliano, and closely attached to Giovanni - appear as protagonists. They are entrusted with defending the great Roman writer and statesman, in two impassioned speeches, against the accusations listed in the first part. "He would be worthy of dominion over the whole world," Morone begins, dwelling above all on Cicero's religiosity and going so far as to present him as an "excellent herald of the Gospel," whose works abounded in parallels with the Christian faith. 54 In reality, the use of his name arose from Lando's habit of mentioning illustrious figures and families in his writings and tells us nothing about Morone's studies. It merely testifies to the early fame of the then young bishop of Modena, whom the Milanese Augustinian, his contemporary or only slightly older, may have met in Bologna, where Lando settled in 1531.

The father's absence, uncertainty about the future, constant movements, financial difficulties, 55 and every kind of danger faced by the family - including threats to confiscate their property, demolish their house, and even deprive the mother of her freedom 56 - raised fears that the children's education would suffer. This risk was a constant source of concern to Girolamo. A letter sent in November 1516 to the Modenese scholar Dionigi Trimbocchi asked for help finding a new tutor, because the two boys had learned only the first rudiments of grammar. A letter written the same day to another Modenese man of letters, Panfilo Sassi, similarly urged him to take charge of their instruction. 57 This delicate issue was probably crucial late in 1516 when Girolamo made the risky decision to recall his sons to Modena, where it was possible to educate them "in conduct, discipline, and letters," something that seemed impossible at Bellinzona. 58 Only later, in August 1518, with Salvatico's help, did he arrange for his wife, mother-in-law, and daughters to move to Modena, while the two boys, with their baggage, servants, and tutor, were sent to Trent in imperial territory. 59

The young Giovanni therefore first saw Modena at the age of seven and remained there for just under two years. Although the city was not one of the great centres from which Renaissance culture radiated, it was not devoid of intellectual life in those years, thanks to humanists including members of the Trimbocchi family, Bartolomeo Paganelli, and above all Panfilo Sassi. Praised by Ariosto in his catalogue of distinguished men, Sassi had arrived in the city around 1504 and opened a school of "belles lettres" where, as Ludovico Castelvetro later wrote, "every day, without fail, in his house he explained Petrarch or Dante or some other author at the request of those who attended him." 60 Some who frequented the school, such as Filippo Valentini, Giovanni Grillenzoni, and Castelvetro himself, would be among the founders of the Academy, destined to become the centre around which the city's heterodoxy gathered. 61 The exchanges of letters between Morone's father and Sassi concerning the children's education make it very likely that Giovanni too studied under him. The disciple's extreme youth, however, makes it difficult to suppose that he absorbed the cultural imprint of a man who in 1523 underwent an inquisitorial trial for "errors" such as denying the immortality of the soul, hell, demons, and the sacred character of the Mass, as well as for heretical doctrines on free will and predestination. Sassi nevertheless escaped the inquisitor Tommaso of Vicenza and the disgrace of abjuration thanks to the protection of powerful aristocrats, among them Count Guido Rangoni, whose soldiers tore down the excommunications posted on the city walls and whose pressure succeeded in obtaining the humanist's absolution from Adrian VI. 62

Rangoni had long been very close to Girolamo Morone, as their correspondence shows, 63 so much so that Giovanni lived in his house as a child. The Modenese physician Antonio Maria Betti would recall meeting him when, still a boy, he "came to live in Modena in the Rangoni household." 64 Guido's daughter Isabella Rangoni would marry in 1545 the same Ermes Stampa who had briefly lived with Giovanni at Bellinzona. 65 In 1537 a copy of the Summario dalla sacra Scrittura was found in Claudio Rangoni's house, while other members of the family - along with several of Sassi's pupils - would adopt openly heterodox positions. Claudio's wife, Lucrezia Pico, 66 entrusted the education of their son Fulvio to Don Girolamo Teggia, later described as "the pope of the Modenese Lutherans," 67 and Count Giovanni Rangoni would become one of the "great ones," the recognized leaders of the "brethren." He was repeatedly tried by the Inquisition and finally went into exile in Switzerland in 1566. 68 The Lutheran Reformation was still far too remote at that date for us to suppose that Girolamo Morone and his sons could already have perceived any glimmer of it. Moreover, the statesman's pragmatic activism appears wholly alien to the spiritual anxieties that were nevertheless spreading everywhere, stimulated by the Church's scandalous worldliness and by intolerable abuses both at the summit of the Roman Curia and its corrupt administrative machine and within the regular orders and secular clergy.

Those months instead enabled Morone to forge alliances and provide assistance to members of the most powerful local families, such as the Molza and the Sertori, thereby creating potential support for the pro-Sforza exile movement. 69 During the same period, with remarkable foresight, Girolamo strengthened the alliance with the Medici of Milan. At the time they had not yet been recognized as relatives by the future dukes of Florence and lived in the same parish of San Martino ad Nuxigiam as the Morone. 70 This alliance proved decisive when Gian Angelo de' Medici rose first to the cardinalate and then, as Pius IV, to the papal throne in 1559, immediately after the death of Paul IV and Morone's release. Since the young Medici, a law student at Pavia, could not continue at university after the collapse of his father's fortunes, Girolamo Morone in 1518 placed him under the protection of Raffaele Castiglione, an apostolic protonotary and rector of the college that still bears the family name, founded by his uncle Cardinal Branda in 1429. 71 He also secured the release from prison of Gian Angelo's father Bernardino, a notary and former ducal tax contractor who had been jailed for debt. 72 The friendship between the Morone and the Medici was further strengthened by the events of the following years. The future pope's elder brother, the soldier Gian Giacomo known as the Medeghino, earned the confidence of the new duke when Francesco II Sforza returned to Milan. In 1524 the duke rewarded him by making him castellan and then marquis of Musso on upper Lake Como. He found refuge there after committing a political murder as Girolamo Morone's hired assassin. A few years later, at Sforza's request, the county of Lecco, a Morone fief, was transferred to Gian Giacomo de' Medici, who in return undertook to pay an annual sum sufficient to compensate for the income from the jurisdiction, supplemented by salt revenues from several communities. 73 After Girolamo Morone's death, the duke would grant his sons the small fief of Pontecurone in the Tortonese, formerly held by Gian Giacomo de' Medici; after Antonio's early death, the title would pass to Sforza. 74 As for the future Pius IV, he too benefited from Morone's protection and from the rise of the Medeghino. After completing his legal studies at Bologna, he moved to Clement VII's Rome, where he began his curial career as an apostolic protonotary and formed a close friendship with Giovanni Morone and Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, soon to become Pope Paul III. 75

In 1518, after a brief stop at Mirandola, the family finally managed to reunite at Trent, made safe by its location under imperial jurisdiction. According to Guicciardini, the exiles hoped to coordinate with the Ghibelline factions and provoke an uprising in several cities of the Milanese state, a plan that culminated in the failed scheme of June 1521. This left Girolamo's wife and children few illusions about the possibility of lasting stability. In Maximilian I's territories, however, the Morone enjoyed a precarious calm, surrounded by their children and their most cherished household possessions. 76 It is possible that this first stay in Trent by the very young Giovanni, within the borders of the Empire and under Sforza's protection, remained in later life as a distant and happy memory, associated with the recovered favour of Maximilian I, whose grandson Charles of Habsburg, already crowned king of Spain, would soon be elected emperor.
Girolamo Morone supported him in the succession, writing from Trent to the Spanish sovereign nomine Francisci Sfortiae to express his regret that financial straits prevented him from going to him in person. 77 Thus, after the victory over the Valois won by the alliance between Charles V and Leo X, in August 1521 Morone was appointed Francesco II Sforza's commissioner-general with the imperial army. According to Guicciardini, he became the "inseparable secretary" of General Prospero Colonna and

returned to govern Milan, first as ducal lieutenant and then as supreme chancellor. Marin Sanudo described him as "a man of judgment who held the government of the state in his hands." 78

The Morone family's return to its native city was accompanied by new favours and rewards through Francesco Sforza's goodwill. "I am under many obligations to you personally," he had written from Feldkirch to Amabilia Fissiraga during the family's time at Trent, "and soon, God willing, I shall be able this time to prove it to you and your children." 79 In 1524 Girolamo Morone was among Milan's wealthiest taxpayers, with an income assessed at 32,000 ducats. Yet his return to the political arena would soon bring adversity of every kind. In January 1522 he survived an attack by Ettore Visconti, known as Monsignorin, commendatory abbot of San Celso, who was murdered a few months later on Morone's orders and perhaps those of the duke himself; as already noted, one of the killers was Gian Giacomo de' Medici. In the following years Girolamo worked to organize a permanent militia, with a constable for every parish and a captain for every gate; he reformed the tax assessment and tried to restrict the circulation of heterodox doctrines by regulating the sale of books and making political use of preachers. 80 But as the fighting intensified toward the Battle of Pavia, conditions in the city deteriorated. Milan was a militarily defended island in a countryside devastated by war, while "the entire country is being ruined by the enemy, who roam the countryside at will and without opposition, robbing and burning, taking prisoners, and killing the peasants," as Girolamo Morone wrote in December 1523 to the imperial councillor Bartolomeo Arborio di Gattinara. 81 The Bolognese notary Giovanni Boccadiferro, who met him on that occasion, later recalled that in August of that year the adolescent Giovanni was at Pavia with his father, "who had charge of everything." There he mixed with "gentlemen and gentlewomen," among them the powerful Stampa family, with whom the Morone would be allied by marriage a few years later. He attended celebrations in the cathedral and banquets where he was able to meet leading figures of the imperial party, including Antonio de Leyva, commander of the Spanish army in Lombardy. Morone began his studies at Pavia, financed by the duke of Milan, as would be his later studies at Padua. 82

The year 1524 brought war, famine, and plague, whose mortality continued at least until 1526. Those who could fled to healthier places, and the Morone were among them. At the beginning of the year every gate of Milan had already been armed and placed under a captain, while the parishes assembled their own military companies. 83 Girolamo took part in councils of war and negotiated with the allied generals in the duke's name. On 21 September 1524 the duke invested him with the county of Orio already mentioned, while attempting to confront the tragic spread of disease and famine. 84 A few weeks later, however, the grand chancellor again had to abandon the city and leave it in French hands. He established himself between Lodi and Pavia, close to the marquis of Pescara, Francesco Ferdinando d'Avalos, commander of the imperial army and husband of Vittoria Colonna, who would later have close relations with Giovanni Morone. 85

In those dramatic circumstances occurred the event that most profoundly shaped the family's history. The day after the French defeat at Pavia, on 24 February 1524, when Francis I himself was captured, Girolamo Morone joyfully sent the news to his "most heartfelt consort": "God in His supreme goodness has granted us victory; the French are broken and shattered. I thank God. Be of good cheer; nothing more." 86 Soon afterwards, however, confronted by Charles V's overwhelming power, he conceived an anti-imperial "conspiracy": 87 an alliance between the pope, Venice, and Sforza, supported by France, to overthrow a political dominion that now stretched from Sicily to the Alps. He believed he could count on the marquis of Pescara himself, who had not been rewarded for his decisive part in the victory at Pavia, and proposed that he lead an army to free the peninsula from foreigners in exchange for the crown of Naples. 88 D'Avalos instead occupied Milan, had Morone arrested at Novara and tortured, and after his confession imprisoned him in the castle of Pavia on 15 October 1525. The Morone family, plunged into anguish, could do nothing but attempt at least to save its property. The women had already moved to Crema; the sons, who had remained in Milan despite the danger of plague, had to leave the city after hastily having "all his possessions taken into the castle, with perhaps two hundred men working to carry the said goods inside." Antonio rode "by post" with five companions to the castle of Lecco and was promptly assisted by Giovan Battista de' Medici, brother of the castellan of Musso, who in turn immediately went to Milan "sent by his said brother." 89 Anxiety for the Morone's safety and property eased somewhat only after d'Avalos decreed that their possessions were to remain intact and their business continue "as though the said Count Geronimo were present." He also ordered stewards, agents, tenants, farm managers, and "his other men" to give "every suitable and necessary aid and support" to "his lady wife and children." 90

By then the sixteen-year-old Giovanni was considered fully capable of assuming an adult's duties and responsibilities. Meanwhile his father tried unsuccessfully to escape from prison at Pavia, and the Sforza castle remained under siege throughout the winter of 1525 by d'Avalos's troops, although d'Avalos himself died in December. This led to Girolamo's transfer to Milan. There, in November 1526, suffering from gout, and after unsuccessfully drawing up a will intended to convince the imperial authorities of his poverty, 91 he was threatened with beheading and promised to have his relatives raise an enormous ransom of 100,000 ducats, later reduced to 20,000. It was to be paid to the marquis of Pescara's successor, Duke Charles III of Bourbon, who was convinced that "before his capture he had amassed great sums of money for his own profit." 92 Giovanni was sent to Rome to implore Clement VII's help and to seek the "advice, guidance, and assistance [...] by which he is to conduct himself" from the family friend Gasparo Landriani, to whom his father wrote on 13 November 1526: 93

> I am engaged in negotiations to reach an agreement for my release, but the sum of money demanded of me is great and impossible for me to pay without the help of my superiors and friends. Therefore, among others, placing great hope in the clemency and kindness of His Holiness Our Lord, I have sent my son Messer Giovanni to him, so that, having first kissed his feet, he may explain my condition and fortune and beseech His Holiness to be pleased to assist me with whatever substantial sum of money he thinks fit.

When Giovanni appeared before the pope, he failed to obtain any money and had to content himself with the title of apostolic protonotary granted to him on that occasion. 94 Yet his mission also acquired a political dimension, as suggested by the pope's wish to speak privately for more than an hour with the seventeen-year-old son of the former grand chancellor in order to learn about the new political balance in the Milanese. 95 On his return from Rome Giovanni stopped in Modena, which had by then become a safe harbour where the family could try to collect the money needed for his father's release. On 10 December another of the duke's informants reported from Piacenza that the previous evening he had seen Antonio Morone in an inn, talking with a Modenese merchant and conducting "a great deal of business toward Lodi and Milan, sending people back and forth." 96 Amid dramatic vicissitudes the money began to be raised - and at a high price - "from innumerable merchants of the cities of Milan, Genoa, and elsewhere," 97 and Girolamo himself was released from the castle so that he could solicit loans. "He has found up to the sum of 15,000 ducats, and after saying that he could pay no more, he has again been imprisoned. It is thought that in the end they will cut off his head," a Cremonese informant wrote to Francesco Sforza. 98

3. Family, Education, and City

These turbulent events gravely damaged the family's financial position. As Giovanni Morone himself would repeatedly recall, its patrimony was continually threatened by reversals of fortune. At the time of his elevation to the cardinalate in 1542 he described his situation in words that were proud and bitter at once: 99

> I was a senator of Milan, which is the chief magistracy in that state, and I had a substantial salary. I was summoned by Pope Paul III and, out of obedience, came here and abandoned all the affairs of my household, which rested entirely upon my shoulders, because I had an elder brother called Count Antonio, paralysed and ill for five years, who could attend to nothing, and another younger brother, about fourteen years old, called Count Sforza. The first died in the first year that I went to Germany; because of my absence, the second fell in with bad company, through which he consumed much of what remained of our patrimony and incurred many debts, and I was forced to suffer this loss through obedience.

In their darkest moments Antonio, who died in 1536, 100 and Giovanni Morone risked their very lives. To obtain his release, their father handed the first over as a hostage to Bourbon, who imprisoned him in Milan while awaiting the final 6,000 scudi of the ransom, and gave the second to Duke Alfonso I of Ferrara as security for a loan to the imperial army, then in severe financial straits and advancing toward Rome. Hoping that the continual shifts of war and alliance might offer him a chance to redeem himself in Charles V's eyes, Girolamo offered "to assist the affairs of His Imperial Majesty with all his power." He thereby led the constable of Bourbon "frankly to acknowledge that the said Count Hieronimo, both through the aforesaid aid of three thousand scudi at such a moment of need and through his skill and counsel in matters of war and the provisioning of the camp, had played a most important part in every favourable success of the said army." Only as a result of this commitment was Antonio Morone released from the fortress of Milan on 16 March 1527, while Giovanni's release at

Ferrara was still awaited and the German and Spanish infantry, halted in the Bolognese, at last received their pay. 101 The 3,000 scudi owed by the imperial authorities to Alfonso I soon became 6,000. "The appointed term of days and months having passed, and the said six thousand scudi not having been paid," states a letter signed in Rome on 9 June by senior military and political officers of the Spanish government in Italy, "it is understood that his said son in Ferrara is not being well treated." 102 The money was delivered a few days later, and the affair offered tangible proof of Girolamo Morone's loyalty to the emperor, who confirmed his feudal prerogatives over Lecco and Orio. 103 Back in the saddle in Bourbon's following, Girolamo was approaching sixty and must have been deeply concerned by Antonio's grave illness, while Giovanni had embarked on legal studies that would lead to an ecclesiastical career. He tried to advance that career by asking through the constable, now imperial lieutenant and vice-duke of Milan, for "benefices for the boy."

Still accompanied by a Medici, Giovan Battista, brother of the Medeghino, 104 Girolamo Morone threw himself back into war, this time in imperial service during the Sack of Rome. There he was one of the signatories of Clement VII's capitulation, only a few months after sending his son to implore the pope's aid. According to a family tradition already attested at the end of the sixteenth century, though of doubtful reliability, Girolamo was charged with negotiating the pope's release from Castel Sant'Angelo. He then placed his own household servants and litter at Clement's disposal, by means of which, as his namesake grandson and heir to the house proudly recorded at the end of the century, the pope "under the name of the same count [Girolamo Morone], passed through the army's quarters; for otherwise, had they discovered him, they would have taken him prisoner and perhaps done worse, since most of the Germans were little inclined to Catholicism." 105 Clement VII would later show great favour to Girolamo's son Giovanni, appointing him bishop of Tortona by a brief of 6 December 1527. The appointment, however, had no canonical effect because it lacked consistorial approval, and the see eventually went to the future cardinal Uberto Gambara. 106

Girolamo Morone wrote to Alfonso I d'Este that the pope had behaved unworthily, but he also had to wait a long time for his son's release. This is revealed by a letter written from Naples by Ferrante Gonzaga to the duke of Ferrara on 29 January 1529, from which it appears that Alfonso continued to detain Giovanni despite payment of the security, "on the pretext that the [...] lord Hieronimo had spoken certain words displeasing and threatening to Your Excellency." 107 It is likely that, together with the political and military developments of the ongoing war, this authoritative intervention helped produce an agreement shortly before Giovanni's appointment as bishop of Modena. The pope finally decided upon that appointment in April of the same year, although only "worthy compensation" had been requested for him. As Morone wrote to the duke in March, only a few months before his death, he hoped Alfonso would receive the young man "among his servants." 108 Alfonso I was in fact far from pleased that, without his consent, a city then occupied by papal troops - though destined to be returned to the Este together with Reggio in December of the following year - should see the grand chancellor of Milan's son raised to its episcopal throne. 109 Reasoning and expressing himself, in the Lombard tradition, along the political line joining temporal and spiritual power, Girolamo Morone infused this new letter to the Este duke with esteem and affection for the son who would become his true heir. The young man's great qualities must have been so well known to the duke "that it would be superfluous to express them," he wrote, adding only that "the more he is aided by God and good fortune, the more devoted and steadfast a servant of Your Excellency he will be."

After the Sack of Rome, still serving with the imperial army, Girolamo Morone was in Naples in 1528, where he received the city of Boiano and other lordships in Molise and the Terra di Lavoro as fiefs. The following year he moved to Florence, then under siege by the forces of Charles V and Clement VII. There the grand chancellor of Milan died of apoplexy in an imperial camp on 15 December 1529, leaving many children and many debts. 110 The newly elected bishop of Modena was therefore unable to see him again. Giovanni was then at Bologna, where he had arrived two months earlier in Clement VII's train for the meeting with Charles V, which culminated in February 1530 in Charles's coronation as Holy Roman emperor and king of Italy. Giovanni, who was also able to present himself there to the duke of Milan, remained until the Habsburg sovereign's departure. 111 He could neither hurry to his father's deathbed nor attend the solemn funeral ordered in mid-January by Francesco II Sforza as his first act of government after recovering the ducal title. As the Mantuan resident wrote to Federico II Gonzaga, "Morone's body has been brought to Milan and given a most honourable funeral, [...] notwithstanding that he left behind no very good memory, and in many places much evil has been spoken of his misconduct." 112 While fruitless efforts were made to locate the will he had drawn up in Naples, 113

Girolamo was buried in the family tomb at Santa Maria della Scala, carrying with him his regret at never having met Charles V in person. Leadership of the family passed to Giovanni, who as a cleric could not guarantee the continuation of the house. The family now had to wait for his younger brother Sforza to settle down and stop dissipating its battered fortunes in debauchery, while there was no hope that Antonio would recover from his extremely grave illness.

The Franciscan Cornelio Musso, later bishop of Bitonto, would report that after the young Morone's episcopal appointment a saying circulated in Rome according to which Clement VII had commented: "Today we have made a bishop who possesses all his father's virtues and none of his father's vices." 114 Barely twenty years old, the son of the grand chancellor of Milan quickly gained the esteem of many. One was the Cremonese canon Bartolomeo Fiocchi, who after meeting him around 1530-31 recalled that he was then "held and reputed a very Catholic person, almost a saint on account of his good conduct." 115 According to one of his collaborators, it was precisely this "exemplary life, which was a mirror to our native land," that caused Francesco II Sforza "to make him his intimate, exalt him, and commend him to everyone." 116 The duke of Milan's admiration did not in fact arise solely from the young bishop's moral qualities, but above all from his ability, already at that time, to present himself as an authoritative political interlocutor. He "conversed continually at the court of the said lord duke, indeed stayed there constantly, where his expenses were paid [...] and spoke with His Lordship almost every day, as circumstances required." 117 Hence the official commissions entrusted to him and the decision that he should bless the duke's marriage to Christina of Denmark, daughter of King Christian II, celebrated in Milan on 4 May 1534. 118

It has been observed that the education and political formation of Vittore Soranzo, Bembo's protégé, who would for a time share with Giovanni Morone religious views at odds with Catholic orthodoxy, had instilled in his "veins as a Venetian patrician [...] a distinctive sensitivity that closely linked the government of the ecclesiastical institution to the republic's requirements of order and stability." 119 In the son of the grand chancellor, Milanese birth and his father's harsh example implanted a characteristically Ambrosian blend of genuine religious faith and a fully political perception of relations between secular and ecclesiastical spheres. It was a "weekday religion" 120 that for centuries had paid almost equal homage to Christ's vicar and to imperial majesty, within a state where important ecclesiastical offices went to persons of proven loyalty to Charles V, thus "ensuring that the clergy became an effective instrument of government and imperial propaganda." 121 Tracing the origins and paths of formation of the future cardinal's sophisticated ability to bring temporal and spiritual power, European diplomacy and curial balances into dialogue is a historiographical problem that cannot be solved by simply placing him in a generic company of "humanist reformers" alongside other distinguished prelates of his age. 122 He had no humanist education, left no written texts apart from letters, memoranda, and pastoral ordinances, and was always too absorbed in political and governmental business to devote himself to literary leisure. Nor was his temperament inclined toward it, as he himself admitted when he said that "a man grows weary of reading so many people who write," and that "my nature and will soon tire of much reading and writing." 123

Rather, his formation must be set back within the context in which it began: the Milanese milieu in which the Morone house had emerged and consolidated itself during the fifteenth century amid the endless turmoil of the "Wars of Italy," with their tragic succession of military and moral devastation, health emergencies, redrawn borders, institutional arrangements, and economic balances. On this stage Giovanni's father managed, with intelligent skill, to play a leading role, crossing political alignments and dynastic loyalties and laying the foundations of the path later followed by his son. The degree to which Giovanni's life was marked by his Lombard origins and paternal imprint is sufficiently shown by the following passage from Pietro Carnesecchi's testimony. During his inquisitorial trial in 1566-67 Carnesecchi was asked whether he had enjoyed friendly relations with the Milanese cardinal: 124 Cardinal Morone is one of the oldest lords and patrons I have in this world, for I began to love and honour him as early as 1527, before he became bishop of Modena. The reason for my service to His Most Illustrious Lordship was the friendship and service that my late father [Andrea] had with that lord's father, formed when my father was in the service of Duke Francesco of Milan. During that time he received many favours and graces from the said lord's father, who was all-powerful with that prince.

After Charles V entered Milan and Girolamo Morone was arrested in 1525, Niccolò Machiavelli wrote to Guicciardini that "the duchy of Milan is finished." 125 Tenaciously pro-French like many of his fellow citizens, the Florentine secretary understood that the Spanish conquest of the peninsula's "key"

126 would determine the fate of libertas Italiae and mark its history for centuries. In equal measure, the life, work, and imprisonment - for wholly different reasons - of Giovanni, Girolamo's son, would shape its religious fortunes, perhaps for even longer. The father's tumultuous existence was refracted in that of the son, who inherited his political clarity and diplomatic talent, together with an easy ability to deal with emperors, popes, princes, members of the feudal aristocracy, and urban patricians. Pope Clement VII and great houses such as the Sforza, Gonzaga, Este, Colonna, and Medici crossed both men's paths. Their lives were punctuated by delicate political assignments and offices of government and the dense correspondence these entailed, by harsh imprisonments, and by repeated stays in the same places: Milan, Modena, Trent, and of course Rome.

The institutional sensibility of men such as Morone may also have contained the aversion to the growth of the Church's territorial state that a cardinal of theological depth and European vision such as Gasparo Contarini expressed in his view of the state "added to the Church" as a significant cause of the corruption of religious life and the ecclesiastical institution. 127 Political intervention, seen both as protection against the centralizing tendencies of the Roman Curia and as an instrument for moralizing the clergy and society as a whole, was joined to the firm determination of Milan's urban classes to control the Church directly and to their pride in the surviving remnants of municipal liberty. This was also a product of the conception of Milan as a "second Rome" painted in panegyrics between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries and later taken up by the humanists. 128 Thus, for example, when in 1541 the imperial lieutenant Alfonso d'Avalos, under pressure from the Milanese, appealed to the Spanish ambassador in Rome to ask Paul III to confirm the faithful's right to elect their own parish priest, already granted by Clement VII, "the religious question became a question involving three parties: Church, people, and state." 129

In the state of Milan a decisive role belonged to the Senate, which Charles V supported as the principal engine in defence of jurisdictional prerogatives. Girolamo Morone had been a member since 1507, and Giovanni himself joined it in 1534. As we have seen, he recalled this with pride when he received the red hat: "I was a senator of Milan, which is the chief magistracy in that state." 130 Another future cardinal, the Milanese Ludovico Simonetta, would say that Morone had acted in that office "most honourably," 131 bringing to it a corporate pride that overlapped with aristocratic pride and consciousness of the value of blood. This is shown by a letter of 24 November 1534 in which he thanked the duke of Milan for receiving his natural brother Cesare at court. Aware of Cesare's many faults, Morone asked for indulgence and begged the duke to accept him as he was: "If he becomes an honourable man, retain him among your many other servants and as one of us; if he behaves otherwise, since I would not count him among our own, I beseech Your Excellency to do the same, without allowing any fault of his to diminish the goodwill that in your kindness you have always shown toward all of us." 132 After receiving the purple, on 7 July 1542 Morone answered the Milanese senators' congratulations by signing himself "colleague and son." 133 Throughout the rest of his life he would always show special regard for members of the highest Ambrosian magistracy. At the end of November 1554, for example, when asking Pole, who was leaving for England, to intercede with Philip II in the affairs of Senator Francesco Casati, he wrote that in "those parts of ours around Milan" he had no greater friend and owed more to no one. 134

The fifteenth- and sixteenth-century soil of the city in which he grew up was therefore steeped in the tenacious defence of the rights of civil power, including - perhaps above all - in fiscal matters: whether it was a question of invoking the Spanish governor's support against the lax conduct of the clergy, the small number and poor moral quality of parish priests, or Roman attempts to violate Ambrosian privileges and ancient customs; whether disputes concerned the power of feudal lords to place rectors in possession of benefices belonging to them; or whether political authority sought suitable opportunities to strengthen its position against the Roman Curia and its tribunals. Perhaps for these reasons too, between 1500 and Morone's elevation to the cardinalate in 1542 only four Milanese entered the Sacred College: three members of the pro-French Trivulzio family and Giacomo Simonetta, chosen by Paul III. 135 The young Morone was able to observe the declining conduct of nuns, friars, and secular clerics; the ignorance and widespread poverty of the clergy; neglect of liturgical and pastoral duties; the absence and non-residence of priests and chaplains; the abandonment of rural parishes; the accumulation of benefices; sometimes ostentatious worldliness; and the recalcitrance of cathedral and collegiate chapters, both in the cities and in territories where a solidly urban patrician family such as his owned substantial property.

Preachers' threats against the sins of religious men and women periodically shook Milan. In 1516 there were the anti-ecclesiastical invectives of Girolamo of Siena, who preached in the cathedral chiefly to women, making the church inaccessible to the local clergy while admonishing priests and friars. Between 1522 and 1523 the city was disturbed by the prophecies of a friar at San Marco. On 5 September 1529, while Spanish soldiers and Landsknechts bivouacked in the city, a "most desperate homily with great threats" by Fra Tommaso Nieto caused serious alarm, not least because of its explicit political content. According to the sermon, the "renewal of the Church" would begin in the Ambrosian capital itself when Charles V passed through Lombardy on his way to his coronation at Bologna. 136 Other prophetic sermons followed in the city during the succeeding years, sharpening popular perceptions of the irreversible collapse of Italy's fortunes, the universal disorder of political, economic, and moral balances, and the profound crisis of the Church. It is therefore unsurprising that in the early decades of the sixteenth century Milan became an exceptionally rich reservoir of spiritual experiences that were innovative in many respects and intertwined with contemporary transformations in politics and growing religious anxiety. After his breach with Julius II in 1510, Louis XII had summoned from Milan an anti-papal Gallican council, which opened at Pisa and was then transferred to Milan. In its train - while the pope summoned the Fifth Lateran Council in Rome - came prelates, theologians, and jurists who openly discussed religious and political reforms and even the possible canonization of the "Italian Luther," Girolamo Savonarola. 137 In the following years convents and monasteries, both female and male, hosted charismatic figures capable of attracting members of the urban elite, reviving the fifteenth-century precedent of the Franciscan Amadeo de Menes Silva, whose visionary and thaumaturgic religious charisma had found an audience at the Sforza court. 138 At the beginning of the sixteenth century the Augustinian convent of Santa Marta and the Benedictine house of Santa Margherita sheltered prophetic mystics. Among them were the abbess of noble birth Margherita (Arcangela) Panigarola, who from Santa Marta - where Morone sometimes attended Mass in 1534-35 139 - directed the congregation of Eternal Wisdom, dissolved at her death and the fall of the French, and Maria Caterina Brugora, of humble origins and regarded as a living saint, whose prophecies and visions were collected and transcribed by her confessors and preserved by her disciples.

This spiritual ferment culminated in the 1530s with the creation of the orders of the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul Beheaded and the Angelic Sisters of Saint Paul Converted, founded by the Dominican Battista Carioni, known as Fra Battista da Crema, whose followers were suspected of heterodoxy by Paul III. The political and financial contribution of Countess Ludovica Torelli, lady of Guastalla, whose spiritual director Carioni became, was fundamental. On the whole these experiences enjoyed the favour of the local elites, partly because they took the form of spontaneous confraternal associations, at times severely penitential, but remained outside the doctrinal rigidity of the traditional religious orders and the local Church. This did not prevent members of both the secular and regular clergy from joining them, among them the inquisitor Melchiorre Crivelli. Women often predominated in these communities, as shown by the case of the young nun Paola Antonia, born Virginia Negri, who soon rose to the role of "divine mother and teacher" not only of the Angelicals but also of the Barnabites. For years she exercised almost absolute charismatic power over them, which even the Roman Holy Office would find difficult to break. 140 Milan in the 1530s also saw significant innovations in education through the pioneering work of the priest Castellino da Castello and the association he initially called the Company of Christian Reformation in Charity. It was led by a priest but otherwise entirely lay; because its name too strongly evoked the Protestant Reformation, it later became the Company of the Servants of Little Children in Charity. Its rules were approved in 1540 and officially published in 1555. 141

The proclamation of new doctrines, spiritual and intellectual restlessness, political insecurity, the erosion of traditions of self-government, and renewed popular participation in defending ecclesiastical prerogatives and local liturgical traditions: these were among the features of the Milanese landscape in those years, generally also marked by the absenteeism of the diocesan leadership. Since the beginning of the sixteenth century Milan had relinquished the "popular ambition to have a true bishop" and grown accustomed to regarding the ordinary as "a lord who governed through vicars," as did the two Ippolito d'Este who successively occupied the episcopal throne in the early decades of the century. The first took possession of the diocese at the end of the fifteenth century after being chosen at only eighteen through an agreement among his father, Duke Ercole I, his brother-in-law Ludovico Sforza, and Alexander VI. The second became bishop at the age of only ten in 1519, when his uncle resigned in his favour with Leo X's approval. Between 1520 and 1550 Archbishop Ippolito II, like his predecessor, neither resided in nor ever visited the diocese, while causing embarrassment by his determinedly pro-French stance. After

taking the curial office of protector of France, he had his property in the Milanese confiscated by imperial order in 1537. Yet almost all the dioceses of the state in the age of Charles V were "abandoned to themselves, members without a head, a ship without a helmsman." 142 In the middle decades of the sixteenth century, the rector of San Martino in Nosiggia, the Morone parish, neither resided nor wore clerical dress; a paid chaplain replaced him and celebrated only on feast days. Santa Maria della Scala, an imperial advowson that, as noted, contained the family tomb, caused grave scandal because its canons did not observe their duty of residence and confined themselves to collecting their revenues. 143

The decline of Italy's fortunes - this is Chabod's thesis - joined political collapse to the degradation of religious life. 144 This would seem especially true where, as in the Milanese, the failure to recover ancient municipal liberty accompanied the early spread of Reformed doctrines. As early as 1519 Luther's works were brought into Lombardy by the Pavia bookseller Francesco Calvi, who imported them from Basel. Girolamo Morone, then grand chancellor, intervened in 1523 with an edict against the possession of prohibited texts. 145 Francesco's brother Andrea nevertheless continued to circulate heretical works while serving as secretary and steward to Massimiliano Stampa, Anna Morone's husband, who paid him regularly between 1530 and 1537. In the 1540s Calvi still acted as intermediary in secret correspondence between Swiss reformers and Lombard adherents of the Reformation. The Stampa too - who protected Pietro Aretino for a decade - participated in the effervescent religious climate of circles they frequented, including the Ambrosian Jesuati, the confraternity of Santa Corona, and the circle of Eternal Wisdom. 146 The Swiss Confederation was close at hand; the city swarmed with Swiss and German merchants; and it was Lutheran soldiers who in 1526 besieged Francesco II Sforza in the Castle. In 1528 the Dominican prior Bartolomeo Maturo left Cremona as the first Italian religious exile in the Grisons, opening the way for fellow citizens who soon became one of Geneva's largest and most active colonies. Meanwhile, in Cremona itself, adherents of the Ecclesia cremonensis celebrated the Eucharist according to the Calvinist rite. 147 Chabod adopted the category of Lombard "Lutheranism" to designate this "movement," which possessed both common doctrinal elements already highlighted in the inquisitorial trials of the 1530s - justification by faith alone and rejection of every mediation between man and God, beginning with confession, sacred images, and devotion to the saints and the Virgin - and specific organizational features, such as leadership by members of religious orders. 148 The southeastern area, bordering Venetian, Gonzaga, and Este territories, became the chief centre of religious dissent in the Milanese. There Morone was responsible for the parish church of San Giacomo Cremonese, a kind of enclave outside the diocese of Modena. For several years its benefice, which carried the cure of souls, was held by priests such as Girolamo Teggia, already mentioned as one of the recognized leaders of the city's heretical movement, and Domenico Morando, the Milanese bishop's household steward, who was likewise imprisoned by the Roman Holy Office during the pontificate of Paul IV. 149

As for the capital, Milan, Paul III began to worry about its orthodoxy between June and July 1536, when he wrote directly to Giovanni Morone to say that he had learned that "in so pious and distinguished a city" noble men and women who followed Fra Battista da Crema were meeting in conventicles where "many heresies condemned by the Church were professed, especially those called the heresies of the Beguines and the Poor of Lyons." 150 He was referring to the first Barnabites, and this was precisely why he wrote to Morone, expressing warm appreciation of his "learning, piety, and prudence," while bypassing the inquisitor of Milan, who was too closely tied to those turbulent secular clerics. The pope informed the inquisitor only a month later, merely because the bishop of Modena was then in his own diocese. 151 Pope Farnese was alarmed by the lawlessness of the small congregation governed by a woman and by the ferment within it of the teachings of Fra Battista, who had died two years earlier and whose printed works would soon be condemned: the Via de aperta verità, the Opera utilissima della cognitione et vittoria di se stesso, and the Specchio interiore, published posthumously in Milan in 1540. A copy of the last would be seized from the Milanese cardinal at the time of his arrest in 1557. 152

The pope's message reached Morone during the weeks when he was in his native city to take part in the first public display of the Shroud, on 7 May 1536. He held the linen "with the greatest devotion and humility" 153 beside two other bishops, "in the presence of all the people." It was a solemn ceremony arranged at the ravelin of the Castle by his brother-in-law Massimiliano Stampa, castellan of Milan, and in the absence of the Este ordinary it also appeared as an exaltation of the Morone-Stampa family. On that occasion it was decided that three bishops should hold the cloth - among them the bishop of Modena was the only one who was not an Ambrosian suffragan - in imitation of the medieval manner of displaying the Veronica. 154 According to an unconvincing historiographical tradition, the display

was connected with the newly founded Barnabite congregation through an associate of Antonio Maria Zaccaria, Buono (Omobono) Lizzeri of Cremona. He supposedly persuaded Duchess Beatrice of Savoy to exhibit the relic and promoted devotional practices including the Eucharistic Forty Hours and the ringing of bells at three on Friday afternoons in memory of Christ's Passion. 155 Morone, who would later include Basilio Ferrari, elder brother of one of the Barnabites' founders, among the witnesses for his defence, liked to cite the example of that devout and charitable layman. When assailed by the doubt "that he deserved hell, [...] he remembered the suffering endured by Our Lord Jesus Christ [and] was consoled, and hoped that, even if he could not do what Fra Buono did, nevertheless through good works and a good disposition he would be led to that happy homeland of paradise." 156

The French invasions, the gentle slope that brought the Milanese into the Spanish orbit in 1535, and the extinction of political and statutory autonomy gave the Ambrosian Church and liturgy, in the eyes of the local population, an even more strongly municipal significance. This pride expressed itself in the fierce battles against the introduction of the Roman rite and seemed to Federico Chabod the underlying reason for the "limited success" of the "reformers' doctrines" in the capital. The spread was restricted - although this requires further investigation - and the Aosta historian compared it with the French sense of autonomy and pride in the Gallican rite. 157 It is nevertheless well known that one of the events immediately preceding the establishment of the Roman Holy Office was the protest of the marquis del Vasto - despite his admiration for the "divine mother and teacher" Paola Antonia Negri and for Bernardino Ochino - against the local inquisitor's lack of zeal in fighting heresy. After learning of this request that the Roman Curia act more vigorously, Paul III, in the consistory of 15 July 1541, entrusted Cardinals Gian Pietro Carafa and Girolamo Aleandro with "universal care of the Inquisition," granting them power to appoint new judges of the faith throughout Christendom and coordinate their work. This was the first step in the institutional transformation of the medieval Inquisition, later sanctioned by the bull Licet ab initio of 21 July 1542. 158

In this climate of coordination between secular and ecclesiastical power, and at times direct intervention by secular authorities in ecclesiastical decisions and prerogatives, it is easier to understand why the medieval custom of dividing the proceeds of confiscations by the Holy Office into three equal shares - assigned to the ducal treasury, the episcopal mensa, and the inquisitorial tribunal - survived much longer in the Milanese than elsewhere. 159 Ambrosian hostility to every attempt to remove judicial cases to the Curia was also connected with distrust of Roman efforts to create zones of extraterritoriality, which culminated in the jurisdictional conflict of the age of Carlo Borromeo. All these elements seem reflected in Giovanni Morone's thought and conduct throughout his life, which at various levels was marked by a characteristically Lombard inclination to mediate between the claims of temporal government and papal hierocracy. As late as 1553, however, when every space for dialogue between the different parties in the Sacred College seemed exhausted, the Milanese cardinal would still try to engage with the president of the Senate, Pier Paolo Arrigoni, in causis fidei. After informing him that the inquisitor of Cremona had come to him with the trial papers relating to several "gentlemen accused and detained for heresy," Morone invited him to find a way around the difficulties that the body he regarded, as we have seen, as "the chief magistracy [...] in that state" had placed in the way of completing the trials. Hence his suggestion that they "appoint one or two senators with whom I, as with everyone, may discuss whatever I think appropriate on this matter. For I believe that all the difficulties will be more easily removed by speaking amicably together than by any other means." 160 Yet the times were changing rapidly, as he himself would very soon discover.

4. From Milan to Rome

The Italy upon which Giovanni Morone's adult life opened was a world devastated by war and famine, politically divided, and everywhere traversed by religious anxieties and hopes for reform. His father had once again shown foresight when, at the end of a long memorandum addressed to Charles V in January 1528, he expressed the hope that "a good peace might be made among Christians and an end put to so many acts of violence, sacks, robberies, ruins, fires, reprisals, and the shedding of human blood." These had continued for decades and would never cease unless the emperor imposed himself once and for all by force, "as befits his royal and imperial greatness." 161 In this setting, especially desolate for papal Rome after the violence, plunder, unspeakable devastation, and sacrilege of the Sack of 1527, 162 the youth of this penniless bishop ran parallel to that of other talented figures who reached the Roman Curia during the pontificates of Clement VII and Paul III. They sought some role, some sphere of action, some ecclesiastical income that might at least partly compensate for the severe impoverishment suffered by

broad sectors of local elites. At the same time, a Church overwhelmed by events threatening its very survival could appropriate new and vital intellectual energies, place them at its service, and derive from them renewed moral credibility, prestige, reforming vigour, and the capacity to confront its enemies.

Indirect evidence of this long-lasting process in Italian history is offered by the dizzying growth of legal disputes arising from the intricate system of benefices, at a time when pensions, commendams, rights of reversion, and every kind of income from nominal offices became in turn the last feeding trough from which to draw, the last sheltering wings beneath which to seek refuge, and the last hope of contributing to the Church's redemption. Carlo Dionisotti's memorable pages describe the progressive clericalization of the great humanist and literary culture that had once found a welcome at Renaissance courts and now, driven from them by their crisis between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, sought hospitality in the shadow of a Church itself tormented by its ancient, unresolved evils: 163 the simoniacal practices that had invaded it in capite et in membris, the endless abuses of the Datary and the Penitentiary, the endemic absenteeism of bishops and parish priests, the ignorance of clergy incapable of the most elementary liturgical duties, and the ungovernability of convents and monasteries. The shame of the Sack was therefore interpreted almost everywhere as a deserved divine punishment. To all this was added the threat of the new heresies spreading across northern Europe and appearing ever more openly south of the Alps.

Morone himself entered the ecclesiastical hierarchy "almost by chance," 164 or, according to a report circulating at the time, "out of spite" 165 on the pope's part toward the Este. His appointment owed more to the role his father had played as mediator of the treaty that restored the pontiff's freedom at the end of October 1527 than to any genuine religious vocation or training in theology and canon law. His studies in civil law at Padua between 1523 and 1525, for which no evidence survives, could only have been precarious and hurried, given his extreme youth and the ordeals he underwent at that anguished turning point: 166 his own imprisonment and his father's, the frantic search for money, the mission to the pope, renewed wars, and complicated movements through central and southern Italy. These experiences were nevertheless fundamental. They brought him directly into contact with the harsh realities of exercising power and with some of the people who would play important roles in his adult life, such as Pietro Carnesecchi and Vittoria Colonna. Many years later, in June 1542, congratulating him on his elevation to the cardinalate, Pietro Bembo would recall having known and esteemed him since he came to Padua at a "very tender" age and remained there "commendably for several years." 167 Yet neither legal learning nor the humanae litterae would ever form part of Morone's cultural equipment. He was a man of action, totus politicus, endowed with uncommon powers of analysis and judgment concerning men and events. Only as a rhetorical convention would Monsignor Giovanni Della Casa, in his Life of Bembo, place him beside Contarini, Pole, Sadoleto, and Cortese as "very great cardinals and most learned men." 168

Those studying at the Bo in those years included Della Casa himself, Gian Angelo de' Medici, and Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, whose friendship Morone would recall 169 although he was destined to become his fierce opponent. The University of Padua also formed a number of distinguished figures who years later would testify in his defence: the Brescian nobleman Girolamo Martinengo, who would remember him as "a modest and honourable young man"; Marco Vigeri Della Rovere, who as early as 1513, at barely twenty years of age, had inherited the diocese of Senigallia from his cardinal uncle of the same name; and the Cremonese patricians Alberico Sommi and Giacomo Gadio, the latter destined to become general of the Humiliati, whose cardinal protector Morone would be. 170 Others included the future cardinals Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, Stanisław Hozjusz, and Cristoforo Madruzzo, as well as many figures later linked in various ways to the so-called spirituali and sometimes investigated or forced into exile in Reformed lands: Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, Ludovico Beccadelli, Marcantonio Flaminio, Alvise Priuli, Apollonio Merenda, Pier Paolo Vergerio, Pietro Martire Vermigli, and Vittore Soranzo. 171

Reginald Pole was also living in Padua at the time. He had previously studied at Oxford and came to the university in 1521 with financial support from Henry VIII. His arrival caused a stir: Marin Sanudo noted in his diary that the English king had sent a "nephew" to Padua. 172 The future cardinal of England opened his household to students and humanists, while his rank enabled him to form influential connections. There is, however, no trace of contact with Morone, although the two may have met superficially, and no document allows us to suppose that the young Milanese regularly frequented the homes of Bembo or Trifon Gabriele, centres of study, literary otium, and lively debate, including on religious matters. 173 It was apparently not from that university, those circles of friends, or those teachers

that the barely fifteen-year-old son of the grand chancellor of Milan drew the first motives for a religious path that would eventually make him Pole's disciple and principal ally in the Sacred College and bring him into a group of prelates animated by vigorous reforming aims, including Bembo, Contarini, and Soranzo.

His paths were different. They passed through the direct and detailed knowledge of the Protestant Reformation acquired during his nunciatures in Germany, participation in religious colloquies and preparations for the council, pastoral experience at Modena, and curial experience in Rome. There Giovanni Morone took his first steps at Clement VII's court, living in the city between 1528 - when a new outbreak of plague had almost depopulated Milan - and 1533, 174 after the splendours of the age of Julius and Leo had been brutally swept away by the Sack. There too he met again former fellow students from Padua, including Soranzo, who like him experienced serious financial hardship. 175

During those years Morone continued to inform the duke of Milan about events in Rome. "The court remains in its usual condition, and in truth it might be called a hospital full of dropsical patients," he wrote on 11 January 1531, making no attempt to conceal his low opinion of a world clinging to its vices and privileges. 176 Lacking the resources needed to sustain the standard of life demanded by his rank and "down to his last penny," 177 he repeatedly asked the duke for help in confronting his "extreme need" and overcoming the difficulties connected with his "bishopric," which people at the Curia were treating as a joke. 178 As long as Francesco Sforza lived, his mother Amabilia continued to send petitions asking him to end the creditors' siege 179 and recognize the tax exemptions granted to the family, its farm managers and tenants, including those on her property in the Lodigiano, especially at Orio. 180 This painful correspondence records the "long and dreadful illness" that struck his elder brother Antonio between 1530 and 1531. The family faced it at Lodi, "not knowing from what quarter to obtain assistance, neither from property, nor friends, nor even relatives," and was forced to survive "without bread or wine and without a single soldo." 181 It also records the "disgrace" that Giovanni could "see with his own eyes" hanging over him, despite having "made every possible effort" to remain in Rome. This periodically led him to ask Sforza for "gracious permission" to return to Lombardy, although his poverty would appear "no less serious" there. 182

The episcopal appointment, the excellent opinion held of him by Clement VII and even more by Paul III, and his sisters' advantageous marriages nevertheless offered better grounds for hope. Fortunately, his younger brother Sforza settled down and did not disappoint their father's expectations. He inherited the title of count, became a senator, and was appointed by Philip II as commissioner-general of the armies in Lombardy and Piedmont and later ambassador to Pius IV in 1563. 183 In 1549 Ludovico Domenichi presented him as "the son of that Lord Gieronimo who once held in his hands the government of this entire state and the management of Italy, through his most prudent experience in the affairs of the world." 184 On 22 April 1557, a month before the arrest ordered by the Holy Office, which he perhaps already foresaw, the cardinal donated his property to him. 185 At Sforza's death in 1578, 186 the house was continued by his only legitimate son, Girolamo, 187 born to Camilla Doria, niece of Andrea, imperial admiral and prince of Melfi. Sforza Morone also had a natural son, Orazio, who in 1580, on the eve of the cardinal's death, would be appointed bishop of Sutri and Nepi, 188 a diocese previously governed by his cousin Girolamo Gallarati. Antonio's natural son Giulio, orphaned in 1536 and legitimized by an imperial diploma in 1554, 189 would eventually live in Rome with his uncle and establish the Capitoline branch of the family.

At the end of the 1520s, however, these developments were far from visible on the horizon. Giovanni could only place his hopes in the Medici pope and the duke of Milan, who pressed the Roman Curia to grant him a pension capable of rescuing him from a poverty "too pitiful for anyone who had known the father, who, although not of great lineage, so excelled in virtue that he can certainly be counted among those of whom Italy in our day has few equals." Yet the father's inheritance could be seen in his son, "the bishop-elect of Modena, [...] an honourable young man of good conduct," who would never fail to fulfil "the good disposition he possesses, from which we hope he will one day give a good account of himself, provided poverty does not prevent him," the duke continued. His words, however, had a disastrous effect on the pope, who was annoyed by this improper interference and "flew into a great rage." 190 Morone's letters to the duke of Milan nevertheless show that already in this period he performed with great acumen the informal work of an agent at the Roman court, providing dense and concise lists of news. 191 At the beginning of 1531, as we have seen, he mocked the court as crowded with hordes of "dropsical patients" thirsting for favours and prebends. Less than a month later, on 3 February, he informed Milan

that famine had forced the pope to dismiss "more than four hundred mouths" and close "all the dining halls: this has given the company so much to talk about that nothing has been discussed at such length for a very long time." 192

Nor should it be underestimated that the assignment of the bishopric of Modena itself provided a test of the young bishop's diplomatic aptitude, which the Farnese Curia would soon appreciate by calling him to the Sacred College when he was barely over thirty. Once he understood that the diocese of Tortona was inaccessible, he succeeded in circumventing the intransigence of both the Este and the pope. As late as the end of 1529 Clement VII was sending threatening briefs to the duke of Ferrara and dispatches to the emperor accusing Alfonso, the "supposed duke of Ferrara," of extending his "greedy rebellion, not content with temporal goods, to spiritual matters." Perhaps foreseeing that the possibility of governing his diocese made an alliance with secular power indispensable, and thus avoiding trials of strength from which he would have emerged defeated, Morone succeeded in November 1531 in reaching an agreement with the duke - despite the pope's opposition and refusal to accept it - although on extremely onerous terms. These included a pension of 400 ducats charged against the diocese's revenues and payable to Ippolito d'Este, archbishop of Milan, from which Paul III would release him only a decade later; 193 renunciation of all the fruits of the episcopal mensa accrued up to that time; retention of a vicar acceptable to the duke; and the duke's approval for appointments to vacant benefices. 194 Morone moved with great skill across a chessboard much broader than the question of the bishopric alone. It involved the investiture of Ferrara, a papal fief, and of Modena and Reggio, imperial fiefs that had come to the Church during the Italian Wars and later returned to the Este, for the renunciation of which Paul III would demand a vast sum. 195

His first official opportunity to display his diplomatic talent, however, came when the pope appointed him to take part, between April and December 1529, in an extraordinary legation to France during the delicate international negotiations that culminated in the Peace of Cambrai in August. 196 The rapprochement between Charles V and Clement VII achieved at Barcelona at the end of June had raised the highest expectations in the Curia. On that occasion the pope commissioned Benvenuto Cellini to make "a broad gold double ducat" on the reverse of which "there should be a pope and an emperor together setting upright a cross that appeared to be falling, with letters saying unus spiritus et una fides erat in eis." 197 This new atmosphere of concord probably led the pontiff to involve the young Morone in the negotiations. No direct documents survive from the first legation entrusted to the bishop of Modena. There is only an undated letter written to him by a Sforza official, which testifies to the visibility already attained by this young man just over twenty, whose praise was intertwined with a deprecation of discord among European sovereigns. Giovanni's moral and civic virtues were still regarded by many as no more than a reflection of his father's, yet the panegyric, besides insisting on the family's greatness and ancient splendour, emphasized that he was going beyond his father's footsteps. 198 Only a few years would be needed for his fellow citizens too to understand that his gifts would allow him to achieve great things in defence of the Church's endangered fortunes, while always remaining faithful to the pro-imperial orientation produced by his family history.

Legations could provide income, but they often required costly personal advances. Life at the Roman court likewise demanded representative expenditure appropriate both to one's own rank and to that of the interlocutors one hoped to cultivate. At the end of the 1520s the wealthy and refined Pietro Carnesecchi was also present in the Curia. He had arrived soon after Giulio de' Medici's election in November 1523 and returned at the beginning of 1529. As the pope's privy chamberlain he also bore the title of protonotary, an honorary dignity held by members of a college that registered acts issued by the Roman Curia and had for centuries been a path toward the red hat. Some said that the papacy was governed more by Carnesecchi than by Clement VII. 199 In Rome he then met Vittore Soranzo and Juan de Valdés, whom Morone probably never encountered in person. 200 Carnesecchi would later recall the circumstances of his meeting with the Milanese bishop, linking them both to Clement VII's "affection" for Morone's "rare qualities and virtues" - reflected in the fact that the pope "was moved to give him the bishopric of Modena long before his age made him capable of such a dignity" 201 - and to their fathers' shared Sforza past. This had enabled Andrea Carnesecchi to receive "many graces and favours from the said lord's father, who was all-powerful" with Duke Francesco II. 202 We do not know what kind of "graces" Girolamo Morone may have granted Andrea Carnesecchi, himself an experienced diplomat and merchant, formerly Florentine consul in Constantinople and, from 1521, Medici ambassador in Portugal. Nor have the circumstances of his long service to the Sforza yet been studied. 203 A letter from Guicciardini to Giberti dated 27 January 1527 suggests that relations between

Carnesecchi's father and Morone's continued almost until Girolamo's death, and that Andrea still gravitated toward Milan as Giovanni began his apprenticeship at Clement VII's court. 204

In 1527 Giberti, bishop of Verona and datary of Clement VII, was in Rome. He hastily took refuge in Castel Sant'Angelo with the pope and thirteen cardinals while imperial troops put the city to fire and sword, and it is possible that Girolamo Morone and Giberti made renewed contact on that occasion after their first meeting a few years earlier. After the Battle of Pavia, when the pope had created an Italian league supported by France, Giberti had coordinated European negotiations centred on Milan. In April 1525 he sent a member of his household, the Genoese banker Domenico Sauli, an intimate friend of Sforza, to Morone. The grand chancellor worked with him and involved him in the pro-French conspiracy. 205 The political convergence between Morone and Giberti established a lasting bond between them, which was strengthened in 1529, when the former datary was recalled to the Curia for several months before devoting himself permanently and exclusively to pastoral work at Verona. There in the following years he implemented a series of reforms destined to become a model for many bishops even after the Council of Trent. There can be no doubt that the measures promoted by Morone immediately after taking possession of the diocese of Modena were inspired by the so-called gibertalis disciplina. Yet already in 1536 he reluctantly had to leave Modena and Italy to begin a long period of almost uninterrupted nunciatures in Germany, 206 which prevented him from attending with the necessary constancy to the many grave problems of his diocese.

Chapter Two

"An Honourable Concord": The First Nunciatures and the Experience of the German Reformation

1. "For Reform and for the Council"

Giovanni Morone was appointed nuncio to Ferdinand of Habsburg on 21 October 1536, after the recall to Rome of Pier Paolo Vergerio, who had preceded him at the court of the king of Bohemia, the future successor to the imperial crown after being elected king of the Romans on 5 January 1531. The death of Francesco Sforza on 1 November 1535 and Charles V's occupation of the duchy had reopened the conflict between Habsburg and Valois, with the French invasion of Piedmont and the imperial campaign in Provence. Meanwhile all Europe was convulsed by political and religious upheaval: in London Anne Boleyn went to the scaffold; in Denmark the Catholic episcopate was abolished; John Calvin published the first edition of the Institutio christianae religionis at Basel; and in Rome Michelangelo began to fresco the Sistine Last Judgment. On 29 July the bishop of Modena was still in his diocese, but already preparing to return to the Curia to receive his instructions. "It is necessary that I go to Germany on account of the affairs of the council, and within very few days," he wrote to Ercole II d'Este. 1 He still had time for a brief visit to Milan, where he was on 7 September organizing the journey, "for which he was very poorly prepared." 2

Morone's appointment was surprising, not least because not everyone had forgotten that he was "the son of the man who caused the ruin of Rome," as Camillo Visconti, the Sforza resident at the papal Curia, wrote. 3 But Paul III, elected in October 1534, quickly recognized the young man's worth. He had been able to appreciate him during the negotiations over the succession to the duchy of Milan, perhaps also bearing in mind Sforza's confidence in him, which the pope could observe in December of that year when he received the Milanese delegation sent to congratulate him on his accession, of which Morone was a member. 4 Morone, for his part, did not hesitate to portray the new pontiff to the duke as a man chiefly devoted "to accumulating money, giving benefices to his nephews, especially Farnese, and preserving himself by exercising and avoiding troubles; and the court is in poor spirits because of His Holiness's slowness and indecision." With great clarity he immediately understood, among other things, that Paul III held Duke Alessandro de' Medici "in little favour" and intended "to deal with the affairs of Florence as his predecessor Clement did." 5 From the very beginning of the Farnese papacy it was clear to him that pro-Habsburg prelates, including himself, would face a conflict of loyalties destined to grow sharper during the following decade. This did not prevent the pontiff from calling him to demanding diplomatic tasks that would force him to remain away from Modena for years. At the beginning of 1535 Francesco Sforza had already expressed pleasure at the "excellent hope given you [...] of going to the Most Serene King of the Romans," 6 a highly prestigious assignment from which Morone nevertheless tried to escape, beseeching Paul III to take account of his

family problems, his poverty, and his pastoral duties, as he wrote to the duke on 26 and 28 January, begging him to persuade the pope to change his mind. 7 But he was soon forced to abandon the hope of being spared the "journey to Germany" and yield to the pontiff's insistent demands. 8 In the brief addressed to Ferdinand, Paul explained his choice by citing the nuncio's many virtues and the longstanding loyalty that both he and his father had shown to the House of Austria. 9

There can be no doubt that it was above all Morone's political intelligence that impressed Paul III, leading him to entrust a twenty-seven-year-old with reporting on German, Bohemian, and Hungarian affairs; representing Roman interests in the most inflammatory religious questions; promoting the council; and taking part in diets and religious colloquies "with the broadest possible powers." 10 In a word, he was to keep the helm of the navicula Petri steady amid the perilous waves of the German Reformation, in which the Church of Rome was foundering. In June 1557, when questioned by the inquisitors, Morone would state, as already noted, that at the time he "was a senator of Milan," and had answered the pontiff's summons solely out of obedience, abandoning "all the affairs of my house, which rested entirely upon my shoulders." 11 He would write in similar terms in a letter sent from Ghent to Cardinal Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora on 21 March 1540: 12

> In the year 1536 I came to Germany to obey Our Lord and for no other reason. God knows with what spirit, faith, and diligence I have served His Holiness there, disregarding every private concern and enduring far greater travail of mind and body than my natural constitution can bear. I had this consolation: I hoped that the honour of God would be restored either through a council or through negotiations for concord, made possible by a good peace between these two great princes. And although I am most inadequate, nevertheless, knowing quod Deus infirma mundi eligit ut fortia confundat, I willingly offered myself as I am, having been called to this office.

No more than this can be known. Yet it is hardly surprising that Pope Farnese's penetrating eye immediately recognized the gifts and capacity for large-scale thought concealed in the son of Milan's former grand chancellor, who had played a leading role, through alternating turns of fortune, in the turbulent age of the Italian Wars. No less turbulent and chaotic - indeed, more serious with every passing day - was the religious situation in Germany, which the pontiff himself described in his confidential instructions as "the extremely harsh condition of these times." 13 A clergy widely discredited, ignorant, and unfit for pastoral work seemed to be collapsing altogether: mired in every sort of vice, largely concubinous and simoniacal, addicted to drunkenness, resistant to any reform, and inclined to embrace the new faith chiefly in order to free itself from the obligations of the old.

The example, moreover, came from above. Cathedral chapters, hunting grounds in which the wealthiest families protected their economic interests, were largely untouched by any desire for renewal; so too were the bishops, members of the ruling classes to whom Luther's protest had offered a chance to escape not only papal but also imperial authority and, above all, to seize the Church's immense possessions. New powers and financial resources strengthened the political authority of princes who adhered to the Reformation, further weakening the already fragile authority of the House of Austria, which was grudgingly denied even the meagre pfennig requested for the war against the Turk. The practice of the sacraments declined; monasteries emptied; preachers replaced priests; cathedral canons became secularized; and nuns expelled from their convents had little choice but to marry priests and friars who, for lack of anything better, sought a place within the Lutheran Churches. Ancient structures of assistance and charity vanished, worsening the growing poverty produced by economic and demographic causes. The hoped-for reform of the Church in capite et in membris, under the banner of a theology of grace and the exclusive authority of Scripture, not infrequently took on the character of a campaign of brigandage against ecclesiastical property. Meanwhile power fragmented among urban patriciates, aristocratic families, and the electoral dynasties themselves, producing ungovernable political chaos. Genuine Christian scruples of conscience became intertwined with every kind of opportunism, and immediate interests prompted abrupt changes of allegiance. Beside the powerful advisers of inept princes, theologians now entered politics in an unprecedented role, ready to tear down doctrines founded upon the tradition of the Roman Church and to assail papal authority with brutal ridicule and abuse, but also to immerse themselves in biblical texts in order to justify Philip of Hesse's bigamy.

Although the papal Church stood at the centre of the storm, Charles V could do little to remedy the situation. He was occupied in meeting the challenge of Suleiman the Magnificent, who dominated the Mediterranean and advanced through the Balkans as far as Buda and Vienna, while also fighting his

formidable French adversary for control of Milan. Both enemies were delighted to profit from the weakness of the Empire and from their objective convergence of interests with the Protestant princes. Meanwhile the Lutheran Reformation continued to win followers and territory, spreading from Electoral and Ducal Saxony to Brandenburg, Württemberg, Hesse, the cities of southern Germany, and the Hanseatic towns. To anyone arriving from Rome, the German world appeared as a chaotic magma, a world turned upside down and throbbing with contradictory forces, social tensions, ambitions, rivalries, conflicts, and profound upheavals. The fabric of papal policy had to be rewoven each day: now to preserve the loyalty of one family or another, now to win the support of theologians, preachers, and ministers through favours and money, now to navigate by sight among the different parties active at the Habsburg courts. It was, in other words, a political chessboard in constant motion, an exhausting Penelope's web that had to be woven anew each day in order to safeguard what remained of the Holy See's authority while conceding as little as possible on the reform of the Church, and at the same time to preserve the bond with imperial power in the name of their shared defence of a christianitas already dissolving. This was exceedingly difficult, given the evident divergence between the Curia's objectives and the Habsburg need to find a compromise capable of reabsorbing Protestant dissent. Such was the exhausting task of papal nuncios and legates in Germany.

The breach opened in the German world by Luther's Ninety-Five Theses, the extraordinary success of his religious message, the burning of the Corpus iuris canonici and the bull Exsurge Domine, and soon afterward his refusal at Worms to submit and recant his doctrines before Charles V had grown ever deeper, until it seemed beyond repair. The great Peasants' Revolt of 1524-25 had made clear to everyone the potential social and political consequences of the new faith proclaimed by the Saxon monk, who had not hesitated to entrust its protection to the princes, with the inevitable conflict with imperial authority wherever the Reformation gradually spread and took root. The formal protest read at the Diet of Speyer in April 1529 marked the birth of a formidable "Protestant" alignment. In June of the following year, soon after Charles V's solemn coronation at Bologna, the presentation of the Lutheran confessio at the Diet of Augsburg and the severe imperial edict commanding the dissidents to submit extinguished every hope of a political solution to the religious conflict. With the creation of the military league signed at Schmalkalden on 31 December and enlarged over the following months, threatening clouds of war gathered over Germany and the matter seemed about to be decided by arms. From the outset, moreover, it had been Rome that pressed in this direction, hostile to every doctrinal compromise and still very far from any genuine prospect of renewal, despite the tragic warning of the Sack of 1527.

Appointed papal legate to the emperor on 16 March 1530 in preparation for the diet, Lorenzo Campeggi had painted in the darkest colours the collapse of the Catholic faith in German lands: entire principalities and cities withdrawing from papal obedience, growing resentment of the clergy, Luther's unstoppable popularity, the spread of heresy, and a religious anomie in which even "the disorders and bestiality" of the Anabaptists could take root. They were "a most diabolical and obstinate sect, whose members go to the fire and to death as though they were going to a wedding," he wrote from Innsbruck on 12 May, concluding that "these are among the fruits of Luther and his sect." 14 Shortly before, Campeggi had addressed a long memorandum to Charles V urging him to put an end once and for all to "this accursed, diabolical, and heretical plague." He stressed that the religious revolt against the ecclesiastical hierarchy had now become a political rebellion as well, "showing no regard even for Your Catholic Majesty": 15

> The sacraments are no longer administered; vows are not observed; marriages are confused even within the degrees prohibited by divine law; murders, thefts, robberies, sacrileges, and fires have reached their height; churches, monasteries, monks, and nuns are given over as prey. No due obedience is any longer shown to either secular princes or ecclesiastical superiors; instead every insult is inflicted upon them without the slightest restraint.

Yet the strategy he proposed for halting this landslide was unrealistic and scarcely credible. He insisted that the first necessity was not to become entangled in a policy of dialogue, but to "take up iron and fire and extirpate these evil and poisonous plants by the roots," and to do so as quickly as possible. 16 The struggle against the Turk should for the moment be postponed, while reform of the Church should be entrusted to a council still far in the future. Given the bitter divisions then in progress, "Satan rather than the Holy Spirit might be present there," and instead of healing the schism it would make it worse, as Charles V himself had to concede. 17 Campeggi's intransigence rested on the unbreakable principle that heretics should not be granted even "the breadth of a fingernail in matters of faith and substance," and that "taking property from ecclesiastics [...] would mean the ruin of the entire ecclesiastical estate."

He stated this categorically in a letter sent from Augsburg on 26 June to Cardinal Giovanni Salviati, 18 who kept him constantly informed about Florentine affairs, more important than German affairs in the eyes of Clement VII. Having resisted every imperial request to summon a council, the papal legate continued to maintain at the Habsburg court that the only way to bend the heretics was "force." 19 "I have always been of the opinion that clemency will accomplish nothing good with these people," he repeated on 11 August, 20 just as he wrote from Brussels on 24 June of the following year: "From what little I see, I judge that there is no remedy for these matters except arms." 21

The nuncio sent to assist him in the German thicket, Girolamo Aleandro, had taken a similar view. He was convinced that "no concession whatsoever" should be made to the Lutherans, 22 but that they should be compelled "with a rod of iron" to return to the Catholic fold, 23 since "history shows that great heresies are never extinguished except with blood." 24 The rebels were therefore not to be subdued through "negotiations and concord," but only by "punishing and reducing them" manu militari, 25 especially because they would never restore ecclesiastical property: "From this it is clear that the scoundrels care no more for the faith than they do for preserving and enjoying the Church property they have stolen." 26 His conviction that any agreement with the Protestants would be "more harmful than war" 27 was reinforced at Regensburg in April 1532 by his reading of Miguel Servet's De trinitatis erroribus, an abyss of heresy that heralded the imminent "end of the world." 28

Despite these pressures, the need to halt the Ottoman advance along the Empire's southeastern frontiers forced Charles V to soften his position and sign the Peace of Nuremberg in July 1532. This revoked the diktat of Augsburg and postponed settlement of the religious conflict until a future council. Heresy meanwhile continued to spread, crossing the Alps and gaining ground even in Italy, while Zwinglian doctrines established themselves in Switzerland. In 1534 a menacing Anabaptist uprising overwhelmed the Westphalian city of Münster, the Protestants reconquered Württemberg, and Henry VIII's Act of Supremacy formalized the Anglican schism. The rupture tearing northern Europe apart was therefore, for the papal Church, "the gravest matter that has arisen since the beginning of our faith," as Vergerio, then nuncio to Ferdinand of Habsburg, wrote from Prague on 2 February 1534. 29 In these circumstances Rome's refusal to undertake reform or summon a council seemed to vindicate the Evangelicals, legitimize their protest, and lend credibility to their doctrinal demands. In that same year, however, the tiara passed from the perpetually hesitant Clement VII to the energetic Paul III, who immediately signalled a new political course by calling figures of great cultural and moral stature into the Sacred College, announcing a serious programme of renewal, establishing the commission that would present the Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia, and promising to assemble an ecumenical council, first convoked at Mantua in 1537 and then at Vicenza in 1538. 30 Curial reform soon became bogged down, however, and the episcopal assembly had to be repeatedly postponed because new winds of war began blowing through Italy after Charles V's occupation of the duchy of Milan. The emperor was also de facto master of Genoa and Florence, as well as the southern and island kingdoms, and his power penetrated the Papal States through his alliance with the Colonna, who would rebel against the pope in the so-called Salt War of 1540.

All this only sharpened the conflict between the Holy See and the Empire in Germany as well, while Paul III's nepotistic ambitions became ever more extravagant, their rationale difficult for Morone to explain at the Habsburg court. It was precisely the plan to summon a council anew that suggested sending a nuncio to Germany. He was to unravel that tangled political and religious skein and persuade Protestant princes and theologians to trust Rome and therefore attend a synod which, in Paul III's actual intentions, was merely to ratify their condemnation. The task was arduous, almost impossible, yet it gave Morone his first opportunity to demonstrate his political talent and to acquire experiences that would leave a profound mark upon him. He arrived in Modena from Rome on 1 November 1536 and departed for Vienna on the fifth as nuncio "in the matter of the council," through which the pontiff intended to "extinguish the Lutheran heresy," as the Modenese chronicler recorded. 31 On 11 November he was at Trent, 32 ready soon afterward to resume the journey to the Habsburg capital. As soon as he reached his destination, he met Bishop Johannes Fabri and discussed with him the increasingly difficult situation that the uncertain prospects of a council - with war still under way - were supposed to remedy. "Unless the council already summoned meets, and meets quickly, the position of the remaining Catholics, of whom alas little is left, will become desperate," Fabri wrote to him the day after their conversation, on 13 December 1536, summarizing its substance in a long Latin memorandum on the clergy's endless abuses and the difficulty of restoring concord. 33 From the very beginning, however, Morone understood that the solution to the German tragedy lay not in force, but in Rome's ability to

implement reform, recover some measure of doctrinal and pastoral credibility, and persuade rather than fight the Evangelicals.

For the first time, a new gaze was being directed toward a Germany torn by conflict. This was not because the young nuncio felt any sympathy for Lutheran doctrines, but because his political intelligence, the lucid pragmatism inherited from his father, and his readiness to grasp what Machiavelli had called "the effectual truth of things" soon made him understand how little could be achieved by raging against the Protestants and threatening them with armies that did not exist. It was better to calm tempers, deplore together the afflictions of Christendom, show understanding and a willingness to forgive, respect people regardless of their religious convictions, and work to unite rather than divide, in the hope that Rome too might finally do its part. Before condemning, one had to understand, so as to explore every possible path to agreement. For this reason, after his arrest in 1557, he would emphasize that from his first nunciature he had collected Lutheran books so that "Catholics might study them and extract the false articles, so that, when the council met, they could be refuted more easily," as had indeed happened through the many Catholic controversialists who took the field. 34 He would also justify his irenic attitude, his affable and generous conduct toward Protestants, and his habit of giving them valuable objects as a means "of learning their secrets." By then confined in Castel Sant'Angelo, he would admit that he had also acted from personal ambition. It would nevertheless be mistaken to see in this only a legitimate desire for success or perhaps advancement, since what motivated him - then as later - was above all the wish to place his gifts at the service of the Church and help restore its authority and dignity: 35

> At this point I am compelled to reveal my presumption, and perhaps my madness, though it will appear cloaked in a good intention. Having spent many years in Germany, I persuaded myself that it should fall to me to serve as the instrument for bringing that province back to obedience and to the ancient religion. I knew that I was universally loved there, that they held a good opinion of me, and that they trusted our kinship of blood, fearing no deception from one of their own stock; and I understood their dispositions very well and knew how to manage them. With this aim before me, and not without a little vanity, I strove on every occasion, wherever I found myself, to do something pleasing to that nation as a whole.

There is no need to retrace here the thousand problems Morone faced during that first mission to Germany, "where every matter grows more tangled each day," amid a whirlwind of events that kept him "in continual solicitude and anxiety, and in fear of failing in my duty." Together with his financial straits, this fed his desire to be relieved of the post. 36 From the outset, moreover, the religious situation he observed on the journey to Vienna appeared desperate. It was no longer marked, as in the past, by "the violence used by Catholics against heretics and vice versa," yet it was no less grave, for the heretical infection had spread still further, as he wrote to Aleandro a few weeks after his arrival, on 8 January 1537, two days after the assassination of Alessandro de' Medici, duke of Florence. Everywhere, even in Catholic territories, he had seen people "so confused that they do not know which opinion to embrace"; everywhere parishes abandoned "because there are no priests, so that the people are deprived of the sacraments"; everywhere the unceasing plunder of ecclesiastical goods, "there being no one to care for them." Hence the urgency of the council, "either to bring back the heretics, to confirm the weak, or to comfort the good," he concluded, interpreting the situation politically but also using it to advance vigorous demands for reform. 37 He had already written in these terms to Aleandro on 17 December 1536, 38 and on the twenty-sixth he urged the pope - who was rather deaf in this ear - to make every effort to open the synod convoked at Mantua, "even though the whole world were ablaze with war," if only to disprove the allegations of "these malicious Lutherans," according to whom "Your Holiness seeks the council and by your actions obstructs it" by fomenting discord between Charles V and Francis I.

This was not very far from the truth, in view of the pontiff's great skill in postponing the council because of the war and the need to precede it with some Curial reform, while at the same time postponing that reform until the future council. "I beseech Your Beatitude to measure my words by the affection and zeal I bear you, and to attribute them to my sincere service and not to any presumption, since I am certain that in your great prudence you have no need of reminders," 39 Morone wrote, fearful that he had exceeded the limits of his office. Yet he continued to insist that the council was the only remedy for the catastrophe that would result from a national assembly, as he told Ambrogio Recalcati on 12 October 1537, "not to offer advice to His Beatitude, but so as not to keep silent about my feeble judgment." 40 The repeated postponements of the following months led him to point out on 30 October that many at the Habsburg court now openly blamed Rome for "the wars, the ruin of religion,

and every other evil," 41 although he knew that Paul III was unlikely to listen, and nevertheless continued to send him warnings. "As for the council," he declared on 11 February 1538, "[...] I am compelled to say that His Holiness must in every way begin it at the appointed time: first, to remedy so many disorders in the Christian religion, and then, so as not to lose all credibility among the Catholics of these provinces." 42

2. "Heretics Must Be Treated with Gentleness"

Beyond the convulsive course of German affairs, the young nuncio's dispatches reveal the esteem that his acuity, negotiating skill, and personal integrity quickly won for him. This was true not only in Rome, where Paul III soon recognized him as "the finest diplomat in the Curia," 43 but also at the Habsburg court, where his credibility and his efforts to build a network of acquaintances and friendships around himself would soon prove invaluable. These letters also enable us to understand his way of thinking and acting, his judgments of people and events, and the gradual development of convictions and strategies first outlined during his brief Curial experience and then consolidated in the daily web of meetings and the exhausting labour of explaining advantages and disadvantages to Rome, setting out possibilities, advancing hypotheses, and proposing solutions. Given the circumstances, these were often merely defensive, but questions of principle were always subordinated to the possibility of achieving some result.

Such were the consequences of a political realism that took account of objective difficulties, the complexity of the situation, the strength of his opponents, the weakness and unreliability of his allies, the unavoidable needs of Charles V, the profound crisis of the Church, and the mistakes of his predecessors. Hence his inclination to seek workable solutions, including mediation and compromise, inspired by irenic premises utterly remote from the belligerent intransigence of Campeggi and Aleandro. A concise summary appears in a dense memorandum entitled Agenda in Germany, 1536, written as he prepared to leave on his first nunciature. It began by stating that "religious questions must never be debated, but always referred to Rome," reflecting his awareness both of his lack of competence in doctrine and of the wholly political role entrusted to him, which he nevertheless intended to exercise differently from his predecessors: 44

> Heretics must be treated with gentleness and benevolently invited to resume the customs of the past.
>
> Disputes and injunctions that inflame people's minds must be avoided.
>
> Powers and resources should be granted freely, but at the request of important persons.
>
> Heretics returning to the fold must be received humanely and absolved. [...]
>
> The pope must be dissuaded from insisting too forcefully upon the council and thereby exasperating them; instead, he should welcome those who come spontaneously and invite them as well with the greatest kindness.
>
> Someone should be sent to investigate their intentions in secret. [...] Evangelical preachers should be won over through courtesy. Aleandro's hasty counsels must not be followed.

These were remarkably clear ideas about how to inaugurate a new course in Germany. In April 1537, for example, they led Morone to request and obtain from Rome a brief authorizing him to absolve the "many apostate and heretical friars and laymen" who had appealed to him in order to return to the bosom of the Church; the faculty was granted on 17 May. 45 Two months later another brief gave him full authority to negotiate and ratify any agreement concerning reconciliation with the Bohemian Utraquists. 46 It was after a stay in Bohemia in Ferdinand's company that the political motives behind his irenic approach began to acquire religious overtones as well. "These schismatics, who are called sub utraque, possess such good morals and show such observance of ecclesiastical ceremonies and divine commandments" that they deserved every benevolence, he wrote from Prague on 19 April 1537, suggesting that the pope "gladly and kindly open to them the gate of salvation and extend his hand to draw them into the Church." 47

His realization that these ideal premises also offered the only practicable path produced an early self-confidence. Beyond formal professions of "feeble judgment" 48 and ostentatious scruples about "failing to obey the commands" and "carrying out Your Holiness's orders," 49 he began to point out to Rome the course it should follow and to ask for some sign of concern for "the many peoples who, confused and uncertain about what they ought to believe, have become almost heathen, without divine worship,

without the administration of the sacraments, and without any obedience." 50 His argument thus passed beyond diplomacy into the reform of the Church. It was here, in this first view of the German world, in these early choices of moderation, restraint, and respect for opponents, in his intellectual and moral rejection of Aleandro's hasty and unrealistic solutions - Aleandro being "better suited to combat than diplomacy" 51 - and in this lucid awareness of the complexity of events, that the irenicism later inspiring Morone's political action and episcopal government first took root. It would mature through new experiences until, for a brief period, as we shall see, 52 it found legitimacy and encouragement in doctrinal motives as well.

Morone's orientation emerges clearly from the position he adopted during the controversy that erupted in Germany after the publication of a Latin letter sent on 22 June 1537 by Iacopo Sadoleto, only recently made a cardinal, to Philip Melanchthon, whom he addressed as "most learned, like a brother, [...] professor of theology," expressing the highest esteem for his learning and virtues. "I am not a man who hates anyone for holding opinions different from our own," wrote the Modenese man of letters in a grandiloquent appeal to the shared values of literature, learning, and morum civilitas. He offered and requested reciprocal respect and esteem as the indispensable premise of a concord that he intended to found first of all upon those values. Melanchthon was surprised by the initiative and, only after much uncertainty and delay, finally decided not to reply, 53 allowing the offer of dialogue to lapse. Calvin would do the same with a similar letter Sadoleto addressed two years later to the magistrates of Geneva.

Unsurprisingly, the gesture aroused controversy among German Catholics, especially through Friedrich Nausea. The Modenese cardinal replied to him in a letter sent to Morone, whom he had known earlier in Rome, asking the nuncio to forward it and to raise his voice in support of him, helping to silence accusations and slander. When Sadoleto received Morone's reply at Carpentras, dated 19 October but unfortunately lost, he thanked him warmly on 22 November for being one of the few to defend him. He expressed astonishment that anyone could have doubted his good intentions in trying to establish a relationship of trust with the authoritative praeceptor Germaniae, through whom he might later "achieve some fine result for the benefit of the holy Catholic faith and the Roman Church." It was only for this purpose, as Morone had immediately understood, and only to win "a little of that man's goodwill as a foundation for my lofty designs," that he had almost humbled himself in the letter, writing "somewhat more submissively than befitted my dignity." He therefore relied upon Morone to defend him from unjust accusations, since he had nothing for which to reproach himself.

After learning that his answer to this letter had not been delivered, Morone hastened to restate its substance in another, explaining to Sadoleto why he had taken his side and distancing himself from intransigent theologians such as Nausea and Eck: 54

> To speak frankly, there are some men in these parts who are reputed defenders of the Catholic faith and of the Roman Church, but who think that our religion consists solely in hating the Lutherans and displaying that hatred through insults and continual pamphlets. They are so fixed in this opinion that, without considering the circumstances, they take offence not only at any dealings with Lutherans, but even at any word spoken about them that is not insulting. [...] In my poor judgment, and apart from the fact that Christian charity requires it, I assure Your Lordship that it is far better to proceed with gentleness toward these modern heretics than to seek to provoke them with abuse. Had this course been followed from the beginning, perhaps the union of the Church would now be less difficult.

Morone's "presumptuous temerity" in expressing his views to Rome 55 was also encouraged by the pope's appreciation of his dispatches and political observations. Paul "has always found him so diligent and faithful that he is greatly satisfied with him," Alessandro Farnese wrote to Aleandro on 6 July 1538. 56 Less clear is the extent to which Morone understood that he was not only the Holy See's representative to the emperor, but also the instrument Paul III employed in his hazardous political balancing acts, about which the pope naturally took care not to inform him. Writing from Prague on 25 February 1538, for example, the nuncio made no attempt to conceal his disappointment on learning that according to the pope "there will be little difficulty in reconciling the Lutherans at the council, because they are not far removed from the truth; and since this has been reported in these parts, it leaves many people uncertain." That, after all, had not previously been the Holy See's position.

His requests to be kept informed about events in the Curia and about the broader designs within which his mission was situated were destined to go unanswered, although he continued asking for replies to his dispatches. "It is pointless to maintain nuncios without writing to them," he complained

on 6 March. Hence his astonishment at the publication of the Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia, a copy of which he received from Rome, probably the first edition issued in Milan at the beginning of the year, followed by the Roman printing in May - certainly not without Pope Farnese's knowledge. "This has caused some persons zealous for His Holiness's honour to wonder that the counsel should have appeared in print while its recommendations have not been carried out," Morone burst out. 57

For almost a year, moreover, his insistent requests to return to Italy and attend to the family's difficult situation were likewise left unanswered. In the summer of 1536 his elder brother Antonio had died after a long illness, while the younger brother, Sforza, then only fourteen, had taken a bad path, partly because of Morone's absence. He was dissipating the family's already exhausted patrimony and ignored attempts to bring him to Germany and find him a place at the Habsburg court. 58 Hence Morone's need to return to Milan. Writing to Recalcati on 13 October 1537, he called himself "ill suited" to deal with "the affairs of Germany, [...] so confused and hostile to the Apostolic See," and pointed out that his brother's death had "left all our affairs without any governance, with a widowed mother of advanced age and a brother in the heat of youth." 59 To this were added the needs of the diocese of Modena, from which he had been absent for far too long, as he explained on 23 March 1538, revealing the rise within him of urgent pastoral scruples. 60

Only in mid-August, after he had been required in June to travel as far as Breslau in Ferdinand's retinue, 61 did the longed-for permission to return and "set the family's affairs in order" reach him in Austria. He was soon to be replaced by Fabio Mignanelli as nuncio and by Aleandro, now a cardinal, as legate. This caused King Ferdinand great displeasure, since he was well aware that "the Lutherans abhor him, and he seems somewhat more captious and obstinate than is useful for this concord," as Morone wrote on 24 July 1538. 62 On 16 September he had already left Linz, leaving an excellent memory behind him. After meeting him in Bohemia, for example, Petr Bechyně, a canon of Prague Cathedral, former correspondent of Erasmus, and future chancellor to Ferdinand I, praised him in a lost Latin letter to Gasparo Contarini. On 27 October 1537 Contarini replied that he rejoiced "that a man of such integrity should perform the duties of legate among you and the Germans: indeed, I love that man greatly, together with his uncommon virtues." 63 Particularly important was Morone's personal friendship with the future emperor, who at the beginning of April chose him as godfather to a son whom he named Giovanni, although the child was destined to die young. 64 "His Majesty and this entire court have given me such an honourable account of Monsignor of Modena's good and holy conduct that God grant there were many prelates like him," Aleandro reported immediately after reaching Linz on 7 September. 65

On his way to Rome, Morone was in Bologna on 28 September. From there he wrote to the canons of Modena Cathedral to thank them for their greeting, but also to inform them that during his brief stay in the Curia he would be unable to address the questions of tithes and "ecclesiastical liberty" that concerned them most. 66 His vicar travelled there to meet him, while in the nearby city of which he was bishop rumours spread that he would soon return or else be appointed legate of Bologna, "because he is an honourable man and has spent two years in Germany as His Holiness's nuncio in the lands of the Lutherans." 67 The political sagacity he had demonstrated had by now transformed the young prelate under the tutelage of the Este court - Girolamo Morone's orphaned son, who had struggled to sustain the family's prestige - into a leading figure in European politics, capable of winning the respect and confidence of both the papal Curia and the Habsburg court. Given what was happening in German lands, this was no small achievement.

The year 1538 brought important events. The Peace of Grosswardein in February seemed to open Ferdinand's path to the Hungarian throne; the League of Nuremberg in June created an alliance of German Catholic princes opposed to the League of Schmalkalden; and the ten-year Truce of Nice, signed on 17 June, suspended hostilities between Charles V and Francis I and was expected to clear the way for the council. Aleandro was entrusted with the undertaking he himself called "extremely difficult, dangerous, and almost desperate": bringing the Lutherans to "an honourable concord." 68 Yet with him the voice of intransigence once again appeared among those Germans "proud and fierce by nature," "hard and ferocious." 69 From his first dispatches he returned to speaking of the "repression of heretics," the "reduction of the Lutherans," and the return "of those who have strayed to the bosom of Holy Church." 70 He hoped that Rome would "show the Lutherans a little of its teeth" and opposed permitting priests to marry or laypeople to receive the chalice - concessions many regarded as a possible compromise that could meet Evangelical demands without injuring indispensable principles of Roman

teaching. 71 He was utterly opposed to the planned religious colloquies, which in his judgment risked placing Catholics and heretics on an equal footing and thereby delegitimizing papal authority. 72

Aleandro remained convinced that even the smallest concession would harm the true faith and the true Church and was therefore "most pernicious to the rest of Christendom." It was also dangerous, because the heretics "would devour us with their wickedness." As he had maintained for almost twenty years, the "most effective remedy" for ending the schism and overcoming "the blindness and bestiality of the Lutherans" was therefore war. 73 For this reason too, as in the past, 74 the papal legate missed no opportunity to send Rome a disastrous picture of Germany. "In these times," he wrote on 14 July 1538, "it seems to me comparable to a body so ill that it needs a priest with the holy oil more than a physician who might promise to restore it to its former health." 75 The only clear fact in that tortuous "labyrinth" 76 of political and religious conflicts, institutional disorder, social tensions, shifting powers, acts of violence, and opportunism was the unstoppable collapse of the Catholic Church, while Hungary sank inexorably between "Turkishness and Lutheranism." 77 Writing from Linz on 12 October, he lamented that no image of Christ, the Virgin, or the saints could be seen throughout the country, "which is almost impossible to believe, considering the former devotion that used to exist in Germany and the fact that these regions are subject to so Catholic a king, who certainly does all that he can, although if he wished to punish everyone he would have to annihilate them all." 78 The same was true throughout the lands north of the Alps, as he wrote on 9 September: 79

> As far as religion is concerned, the affairs of Germany are almost in total ruin. The whole world has grown cold; bells are rarely heard; divine worship and the other sacraments are rare or nonexistent, and no one even thinks about them. The princes - regem semper excipio, stipatum tamen undequaque non sui similibus - are either entirely Lutheran or, in their hatred of priests and their covert seizure of Church property, worse than the Lutherans; the prelates have in no way amended their utterly dissolute lives. [...] Some years ago, seeing a friar was like seeing a white raven; now none can be found at all, and priests are exceedingly few, utterly dissolute and ignorant, and therefore deeply hated even by the few Catholics, if any are still to be found. If any priests possess a little learning, transfugiunt ad lutheranos. I have heard from Monsignor of Modena that more than fifteen hundred benefices with cure of souls stand vacant because Catholic priests cannot be found. In summa, religionis omnis immensum chaos.

Aleandro's prejudicial refusal of every concession to the Lutherans, whom he portrayed as a band of criminals driven only by the desire to seize Church property, and his insistence on the strategy of war and repression - "which alone, and no other, is sufficient to reconcile Christendom in the matter of these heresies" 80 - were the exact opposite of what King Ferdinand desired. The king did not take long to express his profound displeasure at Aleandro's arrival; many considered the cardinal "terrible and impatient." 81 Aleandro, for his part, blamed Morone for failing to warn him of the poor reception awaiting him at court, 82 and a few days after his arrival did not hesitate to accuse him of "having shown himself very partial to this side." Together with the Habsburg sovereign's favour and Morone's "good life," this was one of the chief reasons why he was "more greatly loved and every action of his appeared still better." Although professing friendship for him, Aleandro was careful to report that when Morone's arrival had been announced, "the king and this entire court rejoiced without otherwise knowing his good conduct, but solely because of the memory of his father." He also claimed that some thought the young nuncio had exceeded his duties by involving himself in Milanese affairs.

Aleandro's open personal and political hostility, nourished by envious resentment, descended into malicious gossip when he accused his predecessor of repaying the two modest gilded cups Ferdinand had given him at his departure with "a piece of velvet and one of satin, a matter worthy of note in a prelate professing holiness and not to be excused as anything other than ambition for greater goods and ecclesiastical dignities, pursued by improper means and with persons who had no part in such matters." It was a genuine low blow, accompanied by advice that the pope should continue to show "his customary good countenance to Monsignor," while taking care "to make use of his good qualities and guard against the opposite." 83

Despite these petty attacks, Rome continued to place the greatest confidence in Morone, to the point of offering him the choice between going as nuncio to Portugal or returning to Germany to replace Aleandro, who had been appointed papal legate to the council convoked at Vicenza for 1 May 1538, although it was soon postponed yet again. Morone had no doubt that he should choose the second option, which returned him to the centre of great European politics, although some pointed out that in Portugal he might find a way to enrich himself. 84 Little more than seven months had passed since his

return to Italy, where the family's problems had received some temporary settlement, perhaps during a stay in Milan attested by a letter to Alessandro Farnese dated 15 December 1538. Among other things, it informed him of the many Lutheran books discovered in the city and the heterodox doctrines being discussed and sometimes preached there. 85 His appointment, the briefs of presentation to Ferdinand and numerous political and religious figures of the Empire, and the papal instructions were signed at the beginning of May 1539. 86

On the journey from Milan to Rome to receive his orders, Morone stopped briefly in Cremona to deal with the parish church of San Giacomo Cremonese, which depended on the diocese of Modena. He arrived on 15 February with the reputation of being "an honourable man." He was still residing there on 30 March and returned between 7 and 10 June, by then on his way toward the Brenner Pass. 87 This time his primary task in Germany was to protect the Holy See in the extremely difficult situation created by the Interim promulgated at the conclusion of the Diet of Frankfurt. In light of yet another postponement of the council, Charles V had decided to take the situation into his own hands and attempt to resolve the increasingly festering German religious problem by encouraging meetings and discussions between the more moderate theologians of both sides, with the aim of finding formulas of mediation and convergence on the principal points of disagreement.

The meeting, scheduled for 1 August 1539 at Nuremberg, did not provide for the participation of representatives appointed by the Holy See. For Rome this was a terrible slap in the face, and the consequences that might follow were more alarming still. Any doctrinal agreement reached under imperial auspices would mean the triumph of politics, with its secular demand to restore German unity, over indispensable principles of faith and the papacy's supreme religious authority. It would amount, in other words, to sanctioning the birth of a German national Church separated from Rome, as Morone immediately understood. 88 Papal diplomacy reacted with the greatest severity, but could not shake the emperor's determination to seek a way out without waiting for a council that was constantly postponed and whose capacity to produce religious peace was, moreover, open to doubt. Although the Nuremberg meeting ultimately had to be cancelled, the Roman Curia continued to regard Charles V's initiative with hostility, fearing that extremely delicate questions - including papal primacy itself - would be addressed in improper settings and removed from its control.

Aleandro immediately breathed fire. Writing from Vienna on 28 May 1539, plagued by stones and heart trouble, he declared himself appalled by that unworthy "Frankfurtian villainy" and trembled with rage against the "most wicked and unexpected" decision to convoke meetings in order "to debate and reconcile the matters of the Christian religion (O Jesus!)." In his view this surrendered victory to the Lutherans, who were placed on an equal footing with Catholics in a theological discussion that ignored the authority of the Holy See "against every divine and human reason, against all equity and the perpetual observance of the universal Church." 89 By 13 June he was even imagining new barbarian invasions from the German lands, which were about to renew "those floods of peoples one reads of in earlier times," while deluging the papal Curia with invectives. 90

Yet if Rome had to make the best of a bad situation and attempt to control this strategy so as to prevent disastrous results, Aleandro's scandalized tones, invectives, and "hasty counsels" were of little or no use. What was needed instead was flexibility, the ability to adapt to circumstances, and the respect of the Habsburg court and the Protestant princes, if only to avoid a political isolation that would open the way to still worse solutions, such as a German national council destined to ratify the schism once and for all. Paul III soon understood this and therefore turned once more to Morone: to his political experience, lucid realism, "cold and penetrating" eye for people and events, 91 and readiness to assess possibilities and risks. He entrusted him with limiting the damage, manoeuvring through the German swamp, and protecting Rome's interests and prestige. Thus began the season of religious colloquies, whose failure marked the collapse of every hope for the reunification of European Christendom.

The young bishop of Modena therefore remained Rome's principal point of reference in the tormented German labyrinth, "an instrument extremely well proportioned and suited to this purpose, both because of his experience and knowledge of the dispositions and people of the country and the favour he enjoys with that Majesty and the lords, and because of his virtue and ability." Aleandro was informed of this on 31 May and ordered to write "jointly with him" and always defend his actions, "so that people may know that he enjoys, as indeed he does, as high a standing with Our Lord as any other

prelate of this court." These were certainly bitter words for Aleandro, who found it difficult to hide his irritation. 92 He was also given the choice of remaining in his office or returning to Italy. 93

Shortly before his departure, on 14 May 1539, Morone gave the pontiff a memorandum on "the means suitable for bringing back the Lutherans." Alongside the predictable political demands - peace between Habsburg and Valois, a truce with the Turk, and unity among the Empire's Catholic princes - it displayed complete consistency with the irenic and reforming principles that had accompanied his first departure for Germany in 1536. Foremost among them was the need to "keep the council open, which is a source of fear to the Lutherans and of hope to the Catholics." To these he now added unprecedented doctrinal openings: 94

> Grant communion sub utraque to those who desire it, while holding out the hope that the council will permit the marriage of priests in Germany.
>
> Reform Rome and the Curia, together with all the bishoprics in Italy.
>
> Urgently remind the Italian princes that, following the exhortations of their prelates, they must remove sins and the occasions of sin from their dominions.
>
> Warn the Catholic doctors of Germany not to write any more abusive works against the Lutherans, so as not to provoke them.
>
> Strive by every means to win over the chief Lutheran doctors, without, however, removing them from infected places, since with dexterity they may serve the cause better there than if they were with us.
>
> His Holiness should be gracious and welcoming in audience and generous in granting honourable favours to that nation.

3. "Religious Affairs Are Heading toward Total Ruin"

Giovanni Morone left Rome on 30 May and reached Vienna on the evening of 30 June. 95 The following day he met Aleandro, "who appeared pleased to see me, and I hope His Most Reverend Lordship will continue in this disposition so that together we may attend to the service of the Lord God and of the holiness of Our Lord," he wrote with some scepticism two days later. 96 Yet only a week afterward he sent a memorandum frankly declaring himself "of another opinion" from the cardinal. Aleandro's strategy for resisting the attempt at agreement with the Protestants launched at the Diet of Frankfurt was to persuade Charles V to cancel or at least postpone the religious colloquies and to travel from Spain to Germany as soon as possible at the head of an army. 97

Morone too naturally believed that those colloquies "can never be so well regulated as to take place without harm to the Catholic side and advantage to the opposing party." Yet if the path of a council was for the moment impracticable, it was necessary to adapt to the "path of concord," while first establishing a league between the emperor and the Catholic princes, "who are still many and powerful," and opening it to France as well. The threat would force the Lutherans "to show respect for the dignity of that Holy See." This was admittedly a highly uncertain course, not least because Rome was unwilling to join such a league with an adequate financial contribution. But it enabled papal diplomacy to avoid entrenching itself in total refusal and to put forward some proposal, enough even to make Aleandro reflect: he "wishes to consider the matter and will then decide." To make Rome understand the situation, Morone added that there was no danger of his abusing his extensive faculties, "because I fear that before long in Germany nuncios and legates will be unable not only to abuse their faculties but even to use them," since German affairs were "in a far worse condition than can be imagined." 98

As Morone explained to the apostolic secretary Durante Duranti on 20 June, the Catholic league should precede the religious colloquies "so that these Catholic princes of Germany, being united with His Holiness, may not reach an agreement with the Lutherans at an imperial diet," while making the latter "more tractable and more ready to accept reasonable conditions." Every effort was therefore needed to ensure that the colloquies and diets addressed not only "the danger to Their Majesties' temporal interests," but above all "His Holiness's interest and the danger to religion." Aleandro's support was necessary, and the pope had to loosen his purse strings to finance the alliance. 99 Predictably, however, the cardinal continued to place his hopes chiefly in arms and in the emperor's arrival "with a good company" to "attend to the punishment and reduction" of the Lutherans. It was time to wake up, he warned, because the heretics "will never be brought to order through love and charity," but only "by force or through fear of some great military preparation against them." 100

Morone himself was nonetheless aware that Charles V's arrival, with the full weight of his authority as presiding officer of a diet, might prevent "the true faith of Christ, then the authority of Our Lord and of the Apostolic See, and finally the Empire itself from falling into total ruin in these provinces," as he wrote on 4 August to Giovanni Poggio, then nuncio to the emperor. 101 The following day Aleandro himself addressed an impassioned memorandum to Rome, now also convinced of the desirability of a strong Catholic alliance. 102 He was nevertheless about to return to Italy, accompanied by Morone's penetrating judgment that he left "the opinion at this court of being a learned and experienced man, suited to these Lutheran affairs, if only the vehemence of his nature were somewhat restrained, since it makes His Most Reverend Lordship far less pleasing to people than his other virtues deserve," as Morone wrote from Vienna on 9 October. 103

The situation remained extremely difficult, and the bishop of Modena could offer only bad news. "Religious affairs are heading toward total ruin" because of the emperor's absence and the impotence of the king of the Romans, he reported on 24 October, adding that the elector of Brandenburg was preparing to make the Lutheran faith compulsory in his territories. This could have been prevented if only Rome had agreed to grant him "communion sub utraque specie," as Morone had suggested a few months earlier. 104 His words conveyed a scarcely concealed criticism of Roman policy: its inability to accept compromises while also refusing to enter the Catholic league with adequate expenditure; its failure to understand the gravity of the situation; its reluctance to give nuncios and legates clear instructions, forcing them to sustain their diplomacy with words rather than deeds; its endless postponement of reform that might restore some credibility; and its reliance upon the limited power and meagre resources of the Habsburg sovereigns to protect its interests, leaving them all "the burdens and labours" without contributing a penny, as Granvelle complained at the beginning of March. 105

The real problems - entry into the Catholic league, reform, and the council - therefore remained unresolved. In November 1539 Morone could only repeat what he had written in June, apologizing for being "perhaps bolder than befits me," but again insisting that matters were going from bad to worse. 106 Every hope of escaping the threat posed by the Frankfurt Recess was placed in Charles V, who was preparing to reach the Low Countries but remained reluctant to abandon the prospect of an agreement between Protestants and Catholics through religious colloquies. The Holy See continued to oppose them, and Morone too deplored them, convinced that any agreement would be useless unless the arrogance of the Lutherans were first restrained, as he wrote to King Ferdinand on 30 November. 107

Alessandro Farnese and Marcello Cervini were sent in vain to the imperial court to persuade Charles V to abandon those dangerous colloquies and return to the royal road of a council, although French opposition and the continuing European wars made the council itself highly improbable. Pragmatically inclined to think that, since "we cannot have what we desire, we must take what we can," as he observed on 2 December, Morone nevertheless declared that the colloquies would be a catastrophe for the Catholic faith. He attempted to explain this in another incisive memorandum delivered to King Ferdinand at the end of November and then sent to Rome with a request for approval. 108 "Unless the emperor openly demonstrates, as is his duty, that he wishes to preserve His Holiness, and abandons this most pernicious neutrality by openly siding with the Catholics and the cause of the Apostolic See, I fear that everything will fall into ruin," he insisted on the thirteenth. 109 Three weeks later he reminded Cervini that "the German prelates say that, apart from their desire for liberty, the pretext for their estrangement from the Apostolic See is despair of the council and their belief that Our Lord does not care about reforming the Church." 110

Everything therefore had to be done to end "these religious dissensions, through which so many souls are endangered each day." For his part Morone continued to offer concrete proposals, aware that he was the true - and perhaps the only - thinking mind behind papal policy in Germany and that his opinions were taken seriously in Rome, although in deference to offices and hierarchies he apologized for expressing them so freely. 111

Charles V's arrival required the nuncio to move from Vienna to Ghent. It was a long and difficult journey, lasting a month and a half in the depths of winter. Morone set out for Prague in mid-January 1540 to attend the Bohemian diet summoned by Ferdinand and then headed toward the Low Countries at the beginning of February. He reached the imperial court in early March, a few days after Alessandro Farnese. His requests to be recalled to Italy continued to be ignored, despite the financial straits caused by the pension still charged upon the episcopal mensa of Modena and the payment of debts to which the

income from his "few patrimonial possessions" was assigned. The new mission in the Low Countries entailed further expenditure, and he had to incur debts to meet it.

Hence his request for assistance. He sought no "benefices or anything else of greater importance," but merely the means to perform his role with dignity, having received "not the slightest sign of reward" despite almost four years of uninterrupted nunciature, as he wrote to Cervini on 31 December 1539. [112] On 25 January he complained of "the ill treatment" inflicted upon him by Pope Farnese, since his bills of exchange had not been honoured in Rome, and bluntly asked to be recalled. His services, he observed, were held in such "little consideration by His Beatitude that I am made to endure such treatment." [113] On 11 March, addressing Cardinal Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora, who was replacing Alessandro Farnese in Rome, he again asked for "the favour of freeing me from this exile of almost four years and allowing me to return to my country and rest in my church." [114]

Paul III, however, had no intention of dispensing with Morone's political intelligence, his knowledge of people and events, and his ability even in the most difficult moments to advance proposals and suggest alternatives that protected the Church's dignity. This emerges from another memorandum sent to the pope from Ghent on 8 April 1540, which Morone explained that he had written only under pressure from the two legates who accompanied him on the difficult mission to the imperial court, Alessandro Farnese and Marcello Cervini, newly raised to the cardinalate.

The nuncio began from the premise that, in confronting the German tangle of powers, heresies, conflicts, interests, and ambitions, it was necessary "to proceed either by way of war, by way of friendly negotiations for concord through private assemblies, or by way of a council." There were certainly good reasons to take up arms, "such as disobedience, leagues and conspiracies against the emperor, robberies, acts of violence, and other similar things," in addition to the crucial religious question. Yet religion "does not appear to be a matter that should initially be handled through war." In later years, among the books seized in his private study, the inquisitors would find a Bible in which, as evidence of long reflection, beside the verse from Isaiah (2:4), "nation shall not lift up sword against nation," he had written in his own hand cristianis non bellandum: Christians must not wage war. [115]

In any case, the risks of military conflict were many, beginning with divisions in the Catholic camp and the Ottoman threat, "besides which war can more readily extinguish men than heresies, as has already been seen in Bohemia." This irenic outlook did not prevent Morone from recognizing that "the path of friendly negotiations through assemblies is not only dangerous but harmful, both by reason and by experience." This was due both to Lutheran arrogance and to the fact that "some of our truths, lacking explicit proofs in Holy Scripture, which alone they are willing to believe, and resting instead on traditions handed down by the apostles and continued to the present day, will be difficult to confirm." Hence the danger, lucidly perceived despite his lack of theological competence, "that our adversaries would prove superior in many propositions and we in none," partly because so few German Catholic theologians were capable of matching them.

"There remains, therefore, the third path, that of the council," although it was obstructed by the perpetual conflict between France and Spain, Ottoman pressure, "and many other causes on our own side as well," in addition to the Lutherans' refusal to participate. Nevertheless, he concluded, "considering the person of the supreme pontiff, considering that in the things of God one must not always be governed by human reasons, considering the greater harm that could result from leaving matters in their present state and the need to provide a remedy, and judging that among many evils the greater must be avoided," the only practicable path was "that the council be celebrated, or that everything be done to celebrate it."

This was a clear and unequivocal choice, whose political and ideal grounds he explained in detail. It was the pope's precise duty to make every effort "to satisfy God and the world, even if there were no hope of any good result, at least to discharge his responsibility and for the memory of posterity." All the more so because the Habsburg sovereigns, although not always in agreement with one another, certainly did not desire "the perpetual ignominy of having obstructed the progress of so holy a work." The pontiff, in other words, had to place his trust in the faith he was charged to protect and act courageously, without ulterior motives, because God would stand beside him.

Quite apart from the heresies, moreover, no universal synod had assembled for far too long, "contrary to necessity and ancient custom," while everyone could see the need "to remove the

innumerable disorders found in every nation and renew the deformed religion, because of which God sends the many scourges continually before our eyes." If the council was to aim at extirpating heresy and reforming the Church, it should be convoked only after strengthening the German league. This would "give courage to the Catholics" and weaken "the Lutherans' hope of continuing to steal ecclesiastical property." Once this had been done, the pope could invite them again "with every kindness, affection, exhortation, and even entreaty." 116

As for the longstanding question of the clergy's "conduct and abuses," it was indispensable that before opening the council the pontiff "carry out the reform so long discussed, so that iudicium inciperet a domo Dei and it could not be said at a council, 'Medice, cura te ipsum.'" "The sooner it is begun, the more useful I believe it will be," he concluded. 117 In later years, however, the young nuncio would not conceal his disappointment at Rome's failure to undertake any serious reform. Paul III promised only "in words that he wished to carry out reform," while in practice neglecting "spiritual business and dealing most of the time with temporal affairs." 118

Without abandoning his lucid analysis of reality, Morone in this dense memorandum moved more fully than ever before onto explicitly religious ground. His appeal to the pontiff was also a reminder that he must respect his duties as the supreme pastor of Christendom. It reveals how experience of German affairs had persuaded Morone that politics was not enough and that, willingly or not, one had to plunge deeply into that seething magma of conflicting theological doctrines and earthly interests, without ever forgetting that what was ultimately at stake, despite everything, was the Christian faith. He therefore urged Pope Farnese to go beyond "human reasons" in fulfilling his supreme earthly and divine responsibilities regardless of circumstances, if only "to discharge his responsibility and for the memory of posterity." It was a kind of invitation to stand upright at all times in defence of the faith and the Church. This helps explain why he asked "with every humility and reverence" not to be judged "rash" for stating his opinion so plainly.

From these premises Morone finally proceeded to concrete proposals through reasoning that reveals some essential keys to his political action. His policy rested on reflection that learned from experience and arrived at a reforming irenicism centred on summoning the council, which he never ceased to demand. He repeated that only entry into the Catholic league and the council could free the Church from the danger of "continual servitude," in which some hoped to hold it oppressed "through the terror of Germany." 119 Despite his repeated references to his "poor judgment" and "limited knowledge" of German affairs, it was he, even from Ghent, who outlined Roman policy. This sometimes appears in the abrupt tone with which he addressed the pontiff, once again urging him to "enter and establish himself in the Catholic league," send "suitable men" to the courts of the Catholic princes, "take account of Germany," and do something, in short, to "gain a foothold there." 120

Confirmation is provided by Alessandro Farnese's precise repetition of Morone's concepts and language in dispatches advising the pope to rely above all upon "Monsignor of Modena, whom I know to be knowledgeable and zealous for the honour of God and of Your Holiness," or describing him as "extremely well suited" to manoeuvre skilfully through the intricate web of German politics. 121 King Ferdinand had long shared this opinion and, as the religious colloquies approached, told Morone that he was mistaken in thinking that more authoritative legates should be sent from Rome. 122

Appointed nuncio to the Colloquy of Hagenau on 14 May 1540, 123 Morone left Ghent soon afterward and, travelling through Trier, reached the small German town on the twenty-fifth. While waiting for the planned theological discussions between Catholics and Lutherans, in which only the emperor seemed to place any confidence, he first communicated his "immeasurable displeasure" at still having received no instructions, "not even knowing whether people are alive in Rome, much less how I am to conduct myself." 124 There he was supposed to assist the legate Gasparo Contarini, who wrote on 26 May to inform him of his appointment. 125 Contarini's departure, however, was postponed until the prospects of the colloquy became clearer.

Although pleased that the choice had fallen upon a prelate of such stature, Morone took care on 3 June to inform the emperor that not even an angel sent from Rome would possess a full mandate "to reach an agreement in matters of religion" without the Holy See's approval. 126 His admiration for the learned Venetian patrician was universally shared. Paul III had called Contarini into the Sacred College directly from the lay state in 1535, and he had immediately become the principal inspiration behind the

policy of renewal the pontiff wished to display, entrusting him with leadership of the commission that produced the Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia the following year. 127

In any event, the appointment of the cardinal who led the reforming party in the Curia represented a success for imperial policy. In a memorandum addressed to Contarini on 19 June, Morone painted in dark colours "the discord among the Catholics, [...] the cowardice of the bishops and their scant respect for the Apostolic See." He feared that the colloquy might produce "a half-Lutheran concord, in which they would obtain the articles they call positive, such as communion sub utraque specie and the marriage of priests and other similar things, [...] leaving the others undecided, perhaps under the pretext of referring them to the council." 128 He worked tirelessly to keep the Catholic party united and to make the Habsburg sovereigns understand the gravity of an agreement with the Protestants that excluded the Holy See. "God knows how greatly I desire the arrival of the Most Reverend Contarini, because I recognize that I am not of sufficient capacity to satisfy the present need," he wrote to Rome that same day, aware of the decisive importance of a moment "full of dangers." 129

Yet his conviction remained firm that "the path of arms" was "useless and dangerous." "As for its usefulness, past experience has shown that all Christendom united in the ancient war against the Bohemians could not extirpate the heresy born in that little corner," he insisted once more on 7 July. He also pointed out how difficult it would be "to maintain religion with the arms of men who are irreligious." If a foreign army were contemplated, it was well to remember how "sinewy and powerful" Germany was, always ready to forget its internal conflicts in order "to resist the violence and injuries of foreigners." 130

4. "I No Longer Have the Stomach to Digest These Affairs": The Religious Colloquies

Once again, therefore, it fell to Morone to direct Roman policy in Germany at this extremely delicate juncture. Always interested in knowing not only the facts but also the opinions of his nuncios and legates, 131 the pope had him informed that he continued to hold "his opinion and judgment in high esteem and consideration." 132 Meanwhile Marcello Cervini, who had remained the sole legate to Charles V after Alessandro Farnese's return in May, reported to the Curia that the nuncio was "being slandered, as the son of [Grand Chancellor Girolamo] Morone, for partiality in the affairs of Milan." He was probably referring to a lost letter from Aleandro that the bishop of Modena took as a rebuke or sign of mistrust, since on 3 June he wrote that he had always acted "for the preservation of religion and the authority of that Holy See," and rather sharply invited Cervini not to doubt "that I would subordinate the things of God to any other object or worldly desire." 133

As we shall see, the dual loyalty of Ambrosian origin - to Church and state, to the pontiffs and to the House of Austria - would remain a fundamental problem throughout his life. Perhaps marginal during the nunciatures in Germany, it would force him to manoeuvre with great political intelligence in the 1540s, when the permanent conflict between Paul III and Charles V erupted over the transfer of the council to Bologna, the creation of the duchy of Parma and Piacenza, and the murder of Pier Luigi Farnese. This produced an unprecedented clash between papacy and Empire, which would re-emerge with renewed violence during the pontificate of Paul IV. 134 Yet until his confinement in Castel Sant'Angelo, sometimes through prodigies of political balance and amid considerable frustration, the bishop of Modena, now a cardinal, succeeded in preserving both his personal loyalty to the Habsburgs and his prestige at the summit of the papal Curia.

Beyond malicious insinuations, no one could ever seriously doubt that before being a Milanese subject he acted first and foremost as a prince of the Church in defence of its interests, though he may have refused to confuse those interests with the ambitions of the Farnese or the follies of the Carafa. Antonio Bernardi, bishop of Caserta and deeply attached to him, would state this clearly: Morone was "a great and honourable man, and although his father was imperial, and although he himself is Milanese and his brother was the emperor's subject, this bishop of Modena would consent to nothing prejudicial to the Church, no matter how many requests were made of him." 135

Convinced that "no good conclusion will be reached at this diet, but that after it ends there will be greater disorder in religion than before," as he informed Rome on 8 June 1540, 136 Morone complained that he had no one beside him to help confront "so many labours." Writing on the twenty-sixth, he

made no effort to conceal his irritation at having received "neither news from Rome nor any answer to my many letters, and today forty-nine days have passed." 137 It was an intolerable silence, he complained on 7 July 1540, abandoning him to himself without instructions and forcing him to approach Charles V as "bishop of Modena and a private person." 138 This would happen again in later years, and he would again have to protest against conduct so "harmful to public affairs and also a cause of great displeasure and reproach, depriving me of my reputation as a negotiator," he repeated three months later. "I dare not appear at court," he insisted on 12 October. 139

In reality, this too was in its way a proof of Rome's confidence: a kind of blank delegation to handle the extremely delicate questions hanging over the colloquies, in the certainty that the nuncio was more than "capable." 140 No legate was therefore sent until the last possible moment. Yet Morone was left on the front line to confront the anger of German princes and bishops, who were increasingly convinced "that Rome still follows the Italian proverb, which says: quid ad nos de Germanis insanis?" and sends "certain nuncios with fine and superficial words, but without any effect." 141 Deaf to his protests, the cardinal-nephew urged him to participate in the colloquies, "because His Holiness and all of us place our chief reliance upon you," informing him that without Morone all the Catholic delegates would be "half bewildered and lost." 142

The renewed postponement to another religious colloquy at Worms in October, 143 followed by the Diet of Regensburg, forced Morone to leave Hagenau at the end of July and accompany King Ferdinand to Vienna. On 25 July 1540, shortly before departing, he wrote to Cervini that he was "greatly troubled about my journey because of [...] the plague, the heat, and the danger from Lutherans and other nobles nearby in the duchy of Württemberg." 144 From Vienna, however, the king of the Romans was suddenly recalled to Hungary by the death of John Zápolya, opening another front in Morone's already complicated mission. "I remain very uncertain whether I should follow His Majesty, because military tumults are wholly alien to my nature and inclination, besides which the region, ruined for so many years, and the bestial nature of the people discourage me," he wrote to Rome on 10 August 1540. Once again he asked to be recalled to Italy as quickly as possible, without having to "become entangled in these military affairs." 145

He was far more concerned with the outcome of the colloquies, upon which "all religion appears to depend, not only in Germany but also in the other provinces," he warned on 24 October. 146 His exasperation at Rome's unnerving delays and silences grew increasingly tense, until it crossed the limits of language respectful of hierarchy. "The reforms from Rome do not correspond to present needs and deprive the ministers of that Holy See not only of the will but even of the authority to negotiate, because everyone thinks they are being mocked," he exploded on the twenty-eighth. He also emphasized the "negligence" of failing to inform Ferdinand that he had been sent to Worms. 147

The letters written to him at the beginning of November, although not dispatched until the middle of the month, charged him with going to the diet as nuncio with the powers of a legate a latere. 148 They reached Vienna on the very day the colloquy was due to begin in a city that, in the terrible season, lay no fewer than twenty-two days' journey away. Hence his uncertainty about what to do. He also considered his limited theological learning, which might render his presence useless, and above all the dangerous consequences that could emerge from the colloquy, as he wrote from Vienna on 2 November. Nevertheless, out of obedience he prepared to set out. 149 On the eleventh he was at Passau, 150 and on the nineteenth at Nuremberg. From there he informed Alessandro Farnese that he had arrived safely but still had to face "the bad roads of Franconia and the duchy of Württemberg, which are ordinarily full of dangers but especially at present, since all the countries are under arms." He even considered exchanging clothes with a chamber servant to avoid recognition in the event of an ambush. 151

The most difficult part of the journey remained, together with the "great doubt," Morone continued, "whether I should expose both my honour and my life to this danger." 152 On that same day Farnese communicated from Rome the pope's gratitude for his willingness to undergo such risks and hardships. 153 Morone finally reached Worms on the twenty-seventh, "but not without many dangers, vexations, and expenses," having been forced to take detours and secure safe-conducts. 154

Having arrived unwillingly in the German town, Morone first met Tommaso Campeggi, bishop of Feltre, who had been appointed nuncio on 1 October. 155 He then suffered the humiliation of discovering that Campeggi's instructions did not even mention him. This lent credibility to Granvelle's suspicion that, lacking any official commission, Morone had come merely to muddy the waters and obstruct

imperial policy. He thus found himself in the embarrassing position of representing no one but himself, authorized to negotiate only if invited to the colloquies, "like one of the other ministers and a new counsellor."

His patience, however, had limits. In view of his dignity, his pride, and the tireless commitment he had devoted for years to the service of the Holy See, this was frankly too much, and Rome needed to know it: 156

> It seems harsh and almost intolerable that, after the labours of four years, together with the latest hardship and danger of this journey, I should now have to turn back and lose my standing in a place so public and of such importance. Were it not for the fear of God and the true observance and faithful service that I have always shown, and hope always to show, toward Our Lord, I would lose all heart for serving. I have not wished to conceal this from Your Most Reverend Lordship, more to make you understand the humiliation I suffer not only throughout Germany but throughout Christendom than to resent it in any way, since nothing befits a servant except obedience, as I have obeyed, do obey, and shall obey for as long as Our Lord pleases to keep me in this harsh servitude.

Yet on 12 November Morone had been formally instructed from Rome that, if he could not go to Worms, he should "at least keep the said Monsignor of Feltre continually advised, informed, and admonished by letters, both generally and particularly, about whatever you judge appropriate to be done, because through Your Lordship's reminders and counsels Our Lord is confident that he cannot err." 157 On that same 27 November Alessandro Farnese again reminded him of the high regard in which the pontiff held "the counsel and direction that through your virtue and goodness you will know how to give to the cause of religion." 158

Determined not to swallow this serious personal and institutional insult, however, Morone tersely informed Rome that he would write nothing about "the negotiations conducted thus far," since Campeggi would undoubtedly perform his task in the best possible way. He "appears so diligent and prudent," Morone wrote ironically, "that he has no need of a counsellor as unwise as I am." He therefore reserved the right to offer his opinion only if requested, leaving Campeggi "the burden of the negotiation in accordance with the tenor of his instructions" 159 and abstaining from every public ceremony.

In short, the cup was full. "I truly no longer have the stomach to digest these affairs, which at every hour, because of the little favour shown me, will become more difficult for me and more harmful to Our Lord," he wrote on 12 December 1540, begging the pope to allow him to return home as soon as possible. He pointed out that his arrival in Worms without credentials or instructions reinforced the suspicion that he had come only "to obstruct the colloquy." 160 Campeggi himself confirmed this in a dispatch of the ninth, expressing concern that his colleague's "great jealousy" and openly declared pessimism might "produce extremely bad effects." 161

Morone therefore decided to distance himself from the Holy See's official representative while, through his prestige and the informal relationships he was able to weave, simultaneously taking control of papal policy and steering the colloquies toward a rapid dissolution. His faithful servant Girolamo Rovelli would later recall that the nuncio "used every means and every art to learn of all the documents proposed, so that he could send them to His Holiness the pope in Rome. And I went to fetch them at night, at the greatest danger, so that the Catholic side too could be consulted about them." 162 It should nevertheless be remembered that, despite his long residence in Germany, Morone never learned to read or speak German. 163

Alessandro Farnese hastened to assure him of the pope's confidence in his "diligence," "prudence," and "affection," explaining that the omission of his name had arisen only from the belief "that it served the cause and that the less demonstration made of participating in the colloquy in His Holiness's name, the better." Rome nevertheless understood that it had committed a blunder and immediately sent another brief appointing both nuncios. 164 Morone expressed thanks for such "benevolence," but refused in any way "to alter the course already begun." 165 Despite Campeggi's pleas "with joined hands" that he always participate in the negotiations, Morone continued to "negotiate separately," relying upon his experience and relationships and not greatly caring that this caused "astonishment in everyone" and increased "the jealousies and suspicions" provoked by his arrival. "Since no greater prudence, goodness, or diligence could be desired in that lord, I cannot believe that he acts in this way except for the most urgent reasons," the bishop of Feltre concluded on 7 January 1541. 166

That same day Morone, increasingly furious and unable to conceal it, sent Recalcati a letter addressed to the pontiff in which he gave full vent to his anger: 167

> Necessity compels me to write to Your Beatitude, and it overcomes every human consideration. This assembly is not Christian, and on every side regard is given to private advantage. Some of Your Holiness's ministers are unsuitable, either through incapacity or perhaps through private hopes. I am inter sacrum et saxum, oppressed by useless labours and many dangers. Although I hope that thus far I have not failed in my duty, I do not have the spirit to endure in future, finding myself amid so many difficulties and in continual fear of snares within our own household. In public letters and writings I have sent detailed and successive accounts of all the progress of the present negotiations, keeping silent only about my particular actions in service of the cause and the grave obstacles placed in my way. I am now weary and sated, and without hope of being able to serve, because I fear that sincerity and faith are lacking in almost everyone. Your Beatitude needs faithful and prudent ministers who possess no private interest or design. For this reason we nuncios are not fit to serve you, being already bound by the chain of our private passions or incapacities.

The following day, 8 January, Bernardo Santi, bishop of L'Aquila and then at the imperial court, informed Rome that although Morone was a wise and perceptive man, he persisted in his indignation and abstained from all negotiation. He therefore urged Rome to send a legate of great prestige, since the task was too difficult for the bishop of Feltre alone and required someone possessing far greater authority. 168 He repeated this shortly afterward, insisting that although Campeggi was an excellent, learned, and courteous person, he was not equal to the situation. 169

Morone, for his part, had no esteem for his colleague. He attributed to him no "malice," but only "natural thoughtlessness," twisting the knife in a letter to Cervini on the tenth: "For in His Lordship I seem to recognize no fault other than incapacity, a poor memory, and a greater ease in speaking than is desirable in the conduct of affairs." The wound left by the slap he had received was, in short, still bleeding: 170

> I beseech Your Most Reverend Lordship to arrange with His Holiness that my honour be commended to whoever comes, and that I not be subjected to a second charge like this one, which has indeed been too grave. Although, because of my desire to serve the needs of His Holiness, I have cast it behind my back, it nevertheless remains in the memory of all men of judgment, since it was so conspicuous and contrary to the custom of every prince who does not consider himself extremely badly served by some minister. I had been engaged in these affairs for almost four years, and at the end a new man, of no higher rank than myself, was sent and, in my presence, entrusted with the principal care of all the affairs I had conducted.

In a dispatch sent to Farnese on 23 January 1541, on the eve of his departure for Regensburg, Campeggi expressed the deepest regret over what had happened, while maintaining that they had always acted by common agreement. 171 On the twenty-fifth Bernardo Santi likewise tried to pour water on the fire of those "honourable disputes that arose at Worms in handling the cause," assuring Rome that every question had been managed in the best possible way, although, he minimized, something had been missing from the public acts. 172 Yet on that same day, writing from Speyer, Campeggi reported that he had confided to Granvelle the "sound reprimand" he had received from Paul III because there had been "so little concord and such disagreement" between himself and Morone, creating the suspicion that they had merely "wished to disrupt the colloquy." 173

It is difficult to say how true this was, but there is no doubt that the colloquy ended without result, which amounted to a clear success for papal diplomacy. It was now called upon to prove itself at Regensburg, in Charles V's last attempt to find an agreement between Catholics and Protestants. After sending Rome a long memorandum on the German situation on 12 January 1541, 174 Morone left Worms on 20 January, two days after the diet closed, and commented upon its failure with lively satisfaction. 175 Shortly before, he had sent Contarini a similar memorandum in the hope that he might finally come to Germany. 176

Travelling through the safer territory of Württemberg, the bishop of Modena reached Augsburg. From there, on the twenty-seventh, he resumed his correspondence with Rome, no longer constrained by Campeggi's embarrassing presence, and once again made his voice heard, now even more candid after the affront he had suffered. Besides recommending the dispatch of "a legate to the diet with authority to do something more than we can," he reported that before leaving Worms he had received Melanchthon, Capito, and Johannes Sturm "with tact," exhorting them to work for the "religion and peace" of the German world and "not to be so insulting toward the Apostolic See." 177

He was in Regensburg on 30 January. 178 In his first letter to Farnese, dated 7 February, he returned to the bitter events at Worms only because he was compelled to justify himself. He reported having learned from a good source that the suspicions aroused by his arrival had been caused by Campeggi's jealousy. Campeggi had received "unwillingly" the news that the bishop of Modena would assist him and had asked Granvelle to exclude Morone from "the secrets of the colloquy." This had not happened, Morone added with barely concealed pride, only because he had decided to negotiate separately in his capacity as ordinary nuncio, an office from which he had not been removed.

Moreover, a few days had been enough for him to understand that he could place no trust whatsoever in "the excessive ease, to say no more, of the said Monsignor of Feltre, who either through forgetfulness or natural freedom of speech allowed not only my actions but also my words and counsels to be known to persons who should not have heard them." The Catholic delegates themselves "frankly said that they did not wish to negotiate with Monsignor of Feltre, whom they believed wished in every matter whatever Monsignor de Granvelle wished." Hence Morone's choice to distance himself, "appearing not to negotiate" while in fact taking control of the discussions and leaving the honour to his colleague, whom he had nevertheless always "loved and respected as was proper," he concluded, with one final thrust at the unfortunate Campeggi. 179

On 3 March the pope had the cardinal-nephew reply that he placed such confidence in Morone's "prudence and dexterity [...] that in the end the slanders and suspicions will be thoroughly cleared away, with honour and

"his reputation." 180

As early as January 18, shortly after reaching Worms on his way to Regensburg, where Morone would soon replace him as nuncio to the emperor,[181] Giovanni Poggio confirmed Rome's confidence in him. He wrote to Farnese that he would travel with Granvelle, in part to help "set him on the course that the bishop of Modena thinks best, because each day he seems to me more prudent and wise, especially in this matter, and he possesses the sound judgment and good intentions that Your Most Reverend Lordship knows."[182] Once at his destination, in early March, he repeated his conviction that the young Milanese prelate "understands the matter perfectly, both as an experienced man and as a prudent one."[183] Meanwhile Morone had reached Ghent, from where, on March 5, Alessandro Farnese warmly commended to Rome "the poverty and need of the bishop of Modena," assuring the pope "that he is so useful in the post he holds, and so prudent and well disposed, that he deserves every reward from Your Holiness; and here with me he could not conduct himself better."[184] This judgment was destined to remain in the memory of other cardinals involved in various ways in the German affairs of those years, who knew of the "great praise among the Catholic princes" that his nunciatures had earned him.[185]

5. From Hagenau to Regensburg

In his letter Morone also expressed his satisfaction at Contarini's appointment as papal legate-he would arrive in Regensburg on March 12-and two days later declared himself confident that, with Charles V's support, "these lands may perhaps, through toleration of communion in both kinds and of the marriage of priests, return to the other points of the ancient religion." He nevertheless continued to regard the religious colloquies as unacceptable and dangerous, not least because the Turkish threat left the Habsburg rulers exceedingly weak in their dealings with the Protestants. For this reason, on the eve of Campeggi's return to Italy, he entrusted him precisely-because "I have always known him to hold the opposite opinion"-with reporting to the pope that, in Morone's view, no good could be expected from yet another round of doctrinal discussions scheduled alongside a diet,[186] in which "all parties, under the pretext of religion, pursue their own private interests and advantage."[187]

Something changed, however, with the arrival of the Venetian cardinal, who believed that the colloquies might produce a positive result. Granvelle had skillfully prepared them and, in the emperor's name, presented the so-called *Liber Ratisbonensis*, based on a text secretly agreed at Worms by the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer and the future cardinal Johannes Gropper.[188] Contarini too was driven by the desire to reach an agreement, although he immediately had to reckon with Charles V's conviction "that the pontiff was strongly opposed to concord in Germany and would work to create discord."[189] The papal instructions he had received before leaving-drafted, among others, by Aleandro-tended to restrict the legate's freedom of action, even while emphasizing that overcoming religious divisions was of fundamental importance to the struggle against the Turk.[190] In this delicate mission the Venetian cardinal brought to bear not only the charismatic authority he enjoyed even in Germany, Charles V's esteem and trust, and the political experience he had acquired as ambassador first to the imperial court and then to the papal court, but also the sophisticated theological learning that had led him to formulate the doctrine of *duplex iustitia*. In many respects this coincided-or appeared to coincide-with Lutheran justification, and he now hoped it would allow him to translate his irenicism into doctrinal formulas acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike.

Events would soon show, however, that those formulas inevitably displeased both sides. One scholar has gone so far as to deny that dialogue between Protestantism and Catholicism failed at Regensburg, for the simple reason that no such dialogue ever truly took place.[191] Too many political considerations underlay the conflict for it to be absorbed into a concord founded on a compromise that immediately proved extremely fragile when the discussion reached the sacraments, to say nothing of the insurmountable obstacle posed by papal authority. By then no one could still hope to return the conflict to the purely religious ground on which, in 1517, an obscure Saxon monk had begun his solitary struggle for a renewed faith. At Regensburg too, therefore, political imperatives prevailed.

For a moment Contarini nevertheless believed. He even persuaded some Reformed theologians, such as Bucer, whose initial skepticism yielded before his sincere irenicism. Morone himself was fascinated by the courage and inherent grandeur of this final attempt to find common ground between doctrines that had

become all the more irreconcilable because they now embodied opposing religious identities. Yet he never ceased warning the Venetian cardinal about those who, on the Catholic side as well, obstructed agreement in order to increase their independence from the emperor, as did the Bavarian dukes, bishops, and abbots.[192]

The theological discussions opened on the twenty-seventh on the basis of the *Liber Ratisbonensis*, to which Contarini and Morone made numerous corrections before it was officially presented by Charles V. That day Girolamo Negri, the cardinal's secretary, described him as devoting himself body and soul to his purpose and willing to remain in Germany as long as necessary "to recover these poor lost people."[193] Indeed, as early as 1530, in the aftermath of the Diet of Augsburg, Contarini had concluded his polemical work, the *Confutatio articulorum lutheranorum*, by stating that to quell the Lutheran rebellion "there is no need for a council, disputes and syllogisms, or scriptural quotations; all that is needed is goodwill, charity toward God and one's neighbor, and humility of spirit."[194] It is therefore unsurprising that he and Morone established a firm unity of purpose and action that would endure.

In one of his first letters from Regensburg, dated March 13, 1541, the Venetian cardinal informed Rome of his great esteem for the Milanese nuncio, "a man of such prudence, distinction, and loyal service to Our Lord."[195] He was confirming the favorable opinion he had formed as early as 1537, evidently after encounters at the curia in which he had glimpsed Morone's uncommon virtues.[196] "The Most Reverend Legate gives complete satisfaction through his goodness, prudence, and learning," Morone echoed the following day, emphasizing Contarini's "extraordinary gentleness." This enabled him to restrain the doctrinal intransigence of Johannes Eck on one side and of the Lutherans on the other, who "may perhaps concede to the quality of the man what until now they have refused to concede to the dignity of his office." They had entered the dance, he concluded, and could only hope that the colloquies would produce some result, although he remained doubtful that it would be possible "to reach a Christian conclusion on every article." As he wrote to Rome on April 28: "Now that we are out upon the waves, we must urgently have prayers offered to God that He bring us safely into port."[197]

As is well known, events would ultimately vindicate his pessimism. Yet Morone himself was won over by Contarini's personality, theological culture, intellectual and moral stature, and commitment to healing the fracture in Christendom. He came to believe that an agreement was possible and, as we shall see, that it might even calm the religious unrest growing ever stronger in his distant diocese of Modena.[198] Despite the failure at Regensburg, on June 2 he still maintained that one "could not agree with the heretics, but neither could one refrain from refuting them-yet with gentleness and without the clamor of war."[199] This combined firmness on nonnegotiable principles, flexibility on less important questions, and an attitude of conciliatory moderation.

His bitterness was all the sharper because for a moment he too had believed that an acceptable compromise had finally been reached. On May 3 he was able to announce that on the previous day "agreement was established among these theologians on the most important article of justification." His political realism nevertheless kept him from excessive optimism: he knew that "many difficult passages" remained and that Melanchthon continued to be "obstinate and unyielding." "They are now treating the article on the Church, in which the adversaries have so far refused to admit the authority of councils as they ought," he concluded. Credit for the result belonged above all to Contarini's prestige and great theological learning. Charles V's ministers said that "God in His goodness created him for this very purpose, for he conducts himself with the greatest gentleness, prudence, and learning, in which-with all due respect-he is held to surpass everyone else present here, so that the adversaries themselves are beginning not only to love him but also to revere him."[200] That same day Morone enthusiastically informed his vicar in Modena of the striking agreement on the article of justification, naively declaring himself convinced that the "Lutherans have come over to our opinion."[201]

Contarini's "very great prudence" was all the more valuable in Morone's eyes because it also enabled him to soften the conflicts between Paul III and Charles V: Rome's failure to subsidize the military campaign in Hungary; the continual postponement of its accession to the German Catholic league; and the anti-papal rebellion of Ascanio Colonna, one of the most faithful adherents of the House of Austria. The German princes gathered at Regensburg celebrated the Roman baron as a hero and declared themselves ready to intervene in his defense. In the harshness with which Pope Farnese imposed his temporal authority *manu militari*, they saw yet another proof that he had no intention of relinquishing one of the aspects of his

sovereignty most hateful to Protestant theologians and to the imperial court. The "Salt War" thus helped discredit Contarini's position, which appeared less and less supported by any genuine papal will to mediate.[202] Morone too criticized the pope's conduct, pointing out that greater flexibility would have been highly useful "for the negotiations now under way."[203]

In any case, contradicting his momentary optimism, the attempt to reach a theological agreement that was satisfactory-or at least acceptable-to both sides soon ran aground on the question of the sacraments, bringing the religious colloquies to failure. Morone's dispatches in fact say little about the course of the discussions; he left that task to Contarini, reserving for himself the political questions for which his office as nuncio qualified him.

With a council still distant from the horizon of that turbulent year 1541-which saw the invasion of Hungary, Suleiman the Magnificent's conquest of Buda at the end of August, his alliance with Francis I, and the difficult preparations for Charles V's expedition against Algiers-the failure of the colloquy plunged the German world back into chaos. Imperial circles again began to speak of "leaving each man free to believe in his own way,"[204] of "toleration" for the Lutherans until better times. Morone firmly opposed this prospect. Observing the disastrous course of "religious affairs," on May 15 he wrote despondently that he was now forced "to return to my old suspicions," while hoping that events would disprove his skepticism.[205] Two weeks later he reported to Rome that Contarini "would rather suffer every extremity, even death, than consent to the toleration of false dogmas." Morone repeated what he had always maintained: after those colloquies "Germany will be united and religion will remain suspended, not to say ruined."[206] On May 29 Farnese likewise expressed to the Venetian cardinal his conviction that "Christendom stands in greater danger from this sect than from the arms of the Turk: the latter might deprive us of temporal possessions, but the former may deprive us of the spiritual and essential substance of the faith."[207]

Contarini too had to surrender, admitting that at the beginning of the colloquies he had entertained "some hope," but now had to recognize that "unless God changes the minds of these Protestants, there will be no concord." In letters sent to the nuncio in France on June 12 and 29, he did not conceal that the disagreements concerned "the most essential points," nor that he was unwilling to concede anything that might harm "the good of Christendom and the honor of the Apostolic See."[208] Meanwhile Morone had to defend himself in Regensburg against the charge of being "an enemy of peace," and in Rome against the impression that the papal curia believed he and Contarini had exceeded their mandate in seeking an agreement with the Protestants. He himself had to admit that he had strayed from the path indicated by experience and reason, allowing himself to hope and "supernaturally to believe that some good might be achieved, although in the past I had always believed and written the contrary." He finally returned to what had been clear from the beginning: "either no concord will be reached, which will not be without greater harm, or it will be reached with the utter ruin of religion."[209]

In the weeks and months that followed, Contarini labored to explain to Rome the true meaning of the positions he had adopted at Regensburg, especially on justification. Alessandro Farnese accordingly invited him to refrain from further comment, "because His Holiness believes that, since matters are taking the course we see, the less said about them the better [...] so as not to give the Protestants further material for malicious interpretation and glosses in an improper sense."[210] In reality the failure allowed Rome to breathe a sigh of relief. Freed from the imperial strategy and from the fear that some religious agreement with Protestantism might be reached under the Habsburg eagle rather than the papal keys, the curia could now once again propose the path of a council. It would be able to impose its political control and doctrinal hegemony upon that assembly, governing it through trusted legates and sending to Trent bishops from small or extremely small dioceses, dependent on its support and faithful to its directives.[211]

There must therefore be no talk of the "utterly unlawful and harmful" toleration of Lutheran heresies-as the cardinal-nephew wrote to Contarini on June 15, 1541[212]-for they would only draw greater strength from it, "as they have done until now." Farnese explained this to Morone and instructed him to assure the emperor that the pope was vigorously pursuing reforms in preparation for the council, now the only possible remedy, "all the others having already been exhausted."[213]

The bishop of Modena had likewise insisted on the urgency of "a true reform in Rome and throughout Italy, pursued with the greatest possible diligence and by extraordinary means." In a letter to Cervini dated

June 27, after years of exhausting negotiations, he declared himself convinced that Paul III could now do nothing but "proceed resolutely to the council, overcome every difficulty, and act with authority, placing all his trust in God; unmask these princes and negotiate frankly, looking only to the honor of God, the salvation of souls, and the duty of his office, because if matters are handled otherwise, I fear we shall go from bad to worse."[214] The recommendations were useless, because Rome was thinking of everything except promoting a genuine reform, with grave consequences for the Catholic cause in Germany. Morone himself had repeatedly issued such warnings, and on June 21 Granvelle thundered that "the scandals of the ecclesiastical order are far too intolerable" and that it was "far too unworthy and shameful for the Apostolic See to postpone this reform so long, after so many empty discussions and consultations about it without any result."

The explanation Morone himself offered the imperial chancellor on that occasion must have seemed exceedingly weak even to him. After the colloquy's conclusion, he said, "this reform could have been accomplished in three days. I did not deny that it was necessary, but it had not been possible to consider it until the end of the colloquy, since concord would have required a very different kind of reform from that which must be carried out now that discord remains." Such reform was indispensable, he added on his own account, "to appease the wrath of God, to remove such abominable scandals, and to preserve what little religion remains in this province."[215] In a later conversation between Morone and King Ferdinand, the latter actually laughed when the council was mentioned, "considering the few preparations made thus far for reform, which everyone knows must precede the council." He also repeated the witticism accusing the pope of "seeking a council when it cannot be held."[216]

The diet dragged on for several more weeks and finally ended with a recess that Morone considered neither "very useful nor very honorable" to the Catholic party, as he wrote on July 22. The emperor departed embittered and filled "with indignation against everyone because of the unhappy outcome of the negotiations," increasingly "alienated from His Holiness and from the entire ecclesiastical order."[217] The project of a Catholic league had once again run aground. As the King of the Romans repeatedly told Contarini and Morone, and as the latter wrote to Rome on the twenty-sixth, the conclusion displeased everyone: pope and emperor, Catholics and Protestants alike. "Nothing can be done about restoring the property taken from ecclesiastics; Lutheran preaching and doctrine cannot be restrained-on the contrary, they have grown more insolent after being publicly tolerated here in Caesar's presence; the peace that is made will have no guarantees and will therefore last only as long as it suits the more powerful parties."

Once the danger had passed of a religious settlement reached under Habsburg auspices, and the irreconcilability of the opposing positions on *reformatio* had become clear, the sole "hope of some remedy" shifted to the forthcoming council.[218] Morone's task was complete, and he could at last return to Italy together with Contarini and the imperial court. He left behind the memory of a man of the first rank, whose extraordinary political talent in the service of the Holy See was combined with a moral integrity uncommon among the prelates of his time, winning him a universally recognized credibility and prestige that would soon be confirmed by his elevation to the cardinalate.

During the inquisitorial trial, many witnesses for the defense would emphasize the excellent memory Morone had left behind at the courts of Vienna and Brussels and among the German Catholic princes. He deserved, in the words of the future nuncio and cardinal Zaccaria Dolfin, "everything that can be said of a man of innocent life, exemplary conduct, a most zealous defender of the Apostolic See and persecutor of heretics."[219] Morone, for his part, returned to Italy with an extraordinary knowledge of the people and affairs of the German world. For decades he would remain the Roman curia's foremost authority on that world, able to move shrewdly through its inextricable labyrinth of political powers, religious identities, interests, ambitions, kinships, and constantly shifting alliances.

He also brought home an awareness that the great theological questions which had divided the Church-and now divided Protestantism as well-could not be avoided, but also that heresy could not be uprooted by force. Some attempt at reconciliation was therefore necessary, even at a price, as for a moment Contarini had seemed capable of achieving. Many years later, in early May 1563, during his conversations with Emperor Ferdinand I at Innsbruck, after his appointment as president of the council and in a profoundly different political and religious situation, Morone would remember the turbulent days at Regensburg. The

Venetian cardinal, he recalled, used to say that the "Lutherans wished to set at odds three most harmonious sisters-faith, hope, and charity-who must always remain united."[220]

Morone was still in Regensburg on July 28, 1541, but reached Munich on August 1 and Trent on the tenth, arriving soon afterward in Milan, still following the Habsburg court.[221] There, on the twenty-fourth, he said that for "many public and private reasons" he did not wish to go anywhere else-reasons he would explain personally in Rome-and expressed relief that he would not have to accompany Charles V on the expedition to Algiers.[222] In Modena, however, a rumor circulated that eight mules recently purchased for delivery to him in Milan were intended so that "he might go with the emperor to Spain."[223] On August 29 he warned Alessandro Farnese, asking him to keep the matter "in the strictest secrecy," that he had discovered that everything he had written from the diet "is known throughout this court, which weakens and disheartens servants who wish to remain faithful, as I shall explain more fully in person."[224]

Soon afterward he left for Genoa, still in Charles V's train for the African expedition, and arrived there in early September. He then went to Lucca, where he rejoined Contarini and, between the twelfth and the eighteenth, took part in the meetings at which pope and emperor discussed the prospects for peace and for the council.[225] After accompanying Paul III to Bologna, he moved on to Modena, but remained there only one day, October 6-7, disappointing those who believed he had come "to settle," with "good leave to remain in his bishopric."[226] He immediately returned to Milan in order to "put domestic affairs somewhat in order," as he wrote to Rome on October 18.[227] His desire to attend to family matters had become still more urgent because of the misfortune suffered by his young brother Sforza, then in the service of Ottavio Farnese, duke of Camerino, who had been shipwrecked off the African coast during Charles V's expedition. Morone therefore asked the pope to make good the heavy losses his brother had incurred, "considering that he so readily offered himself in the service of this most illustrious house and willingly went where many others drew back."[228]

Once again Morone had little time for domestic affairs. Events pressed on, and despite his insistence that he be spared further diplomatic missions,[229] he had to draft a memorandum for the bull and credentials by which the pope sent him back to Germany, to the Diet of Speyer, as nuncio "on the council, on reform, on the Catholic league, and on the affairs of the Turk."[230] In the section on the *Reformatio Germaniae* in a memorandum datable to mid-October 1541, Contarini noted that no prelate was to be preferred to the bishop of Modena "for his probity, the prestige of his name, his experience of German affairs, and his efficiency."[231] Since the pope instructed him to remain in Milan, from which the journey would be easier,[232] Morone took the opportunity to make a brief appearance in Modena, keeping the promise he had made on October 7 to return to his church within fifteen days. From that year onward, as a first reward for his long missions in Germany, the diocese was relieved of the pension of four hundred scudi payable to Ippolito d'Este.[233]

Morone reached Modena on November 12, but on the twenty-third had to leave again, "with about twelve of his horses," for Rome. The city chronicler praised him, predicted his imminent elevation to the purple and his renewed dispatch to Germany, "where the Lutherans are," and wished "that God grant him a good journey and the good fortune of becoming a cardinal, for he is a man who deserves every good."[234] Two days before again entrusting the diocese to his vicar, Morone wrote to the Este duke to apologize for being unable to visit him because of the papal summons. That summons prevented him from residing in his diocese "and seeing whether, with the help of God and of Your Excellency, I might charitably clear this city [...] of the bad name it has acquired, not only in Italy but even abroad, because of these innovations in modern opinions."[235]

6. Morone and the Jesuits in Germany

On May 3, 1542, from Mantua, Morone informed Farnese that he had sent Pierre Favre to Speyer and Mainz, Nicolas Bobadilla to Innsbruck, and his own confessor,[236] Claude Le Jay, to Bavaria to sow the seeds of reform.[237] It was therefore the young nuncio who introduced the first Jesuits into Germany, just as he would later be among the first founders of the German College in Rome.[238] They were intended to inspire a reform of the clergy and dioceses which Ferdinand of Habsburg considered so necessary that he repeatedly said it was "impossible for God to tolerate so many disorders in the Catholic Church, in which,

to use his own words, there is no soundness *a planta pedis usque ad verticem* [from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head]."[239]

From the time of his participation in the diets of Hagenau, Worms, and Regensburg, Morone had understood both the potential theological and diplomatic assistance offered by the disciples of Saint Ignatius and the need to establish a solid pastoral and educational framework for the German Catholic clergy, to be entrusted to the Jesuits. They quickly won Habsburg favor. As early as 1540 King Ferdinand had approached Paul III to secure Le Jay's appointment as bishop of Trieste-shortly before Le Jay received a chair at Ingolstadt-but Loyola opposed the proposal under the rule barring Jesuits from holding offices in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The same thing occurred in 1555, when the archduke, with Morone's support, attempted to entrust the diocese of Vienna to Peter Canisius. In the following decades the alliance between the House of Austria and the Society would grow ever stronger, eventually receiving formal sanction in Ferdinand II's grant to the Jesuits of the property of extinct Austrian monasteries.[240]

The first diplomatic employment of a Jesuit in Germany, in the person of Pierre Favre, occurred in the winter of 1540-41 and was strengthened by his closeness to the young nuncio, whose confessor he too became.[241] Contarini and Morone themselves asked Paul III to send him first to Worms, in January 1541, and then to Regensburg.[242] After returning to Modena, Morone expressed to Favre his disappointment with the German experience, saying that only the Jesuits' contribution had consoled him.[243] In any case, they laid the foundations of the Society's permanent presence in German lands, not without provoking Carafa's fury.

In the winter of 1542 Favre was joined in Mainz by the young confrere Peter Canisius, who remained his disciple until Favre's death in 1546.[244] Canisius too soon discovered the many obstacles confronting his mission. At Worms he could not debate with Protestant theologians as he wished and was forced to recognize the absence of any genuine desire for dialogue; Granvelle even forbade him to teach the catechism to children. Through him, however, the Society began to understand the immense political, religious, and economic problems at stake, as well as the moral and cultural inadequacies of the German clergy.

Favre sought direct contacts and attempted to exercise influence over several members of Granvelle's family, as well as over many participants in the religious colloquies. These relationships bore fruit in the decades to come.[245] Two other Jesuits present at the colloquies worked closely with him: Bobadilla-who had already served Pole at Viterbo in 1541 and was then sent with Morone to Speyer[246]-and Le Jay, who shared his conviction that the training of the German Catholic clergy was the only effective bulwark against Lutheranism.[247] At Speyer Bobadilla informed Le Jay of Morone's instructions that he go to King Ferdinand's court to work with the nuncio Girolamo Verallo, or, if he preferred, with Albert of Brandenburg, cardinal of Mainz. Instead Le Jay was sent to Bavaria and the upper Danube region, with orders to work in Regensburg, Ingolstadt, Dillingen, and Salzburg. He left Speyer shortly before Favre arrived; Favre in turn was bound for Regensburg and then Vienna.[248]

There is no doubt that Morone and Contarini were more farsighted than Loyola himself in deploying Jesuits and promoting their spirituality and educational structures in German lands. It is nevertheless difficult to determine how, and to what extent, these perspectives helped define the two prelates' reform projects.[249] It can certainly be said that during the religious colloquies Morone understood that the crisis had to be addressed by rethinking clerical formation. He went so far as to anticipate the foundation of what, a decade later, would become the German College in Rome. From Speyer in February 1542, for example, he wrote to Cardinal Farnese about the advisability of "sending some boys from different places to Italy" and distributing them among "good monasteries and good prelates," in the hope that "particular care would be taken of this in Rome."[250]

The German setting of the 1540s likewise provided the soil from which Peter Canisius's most important theological work, the *Summa doctrinae christianae*, emerged. It was published in Vienna in 1555 at the urging of Ferdinand I, who since 1551 had intended to have a "compendium of Christian doctrine" drawn up as a counterpart to the analogous works of Luther and Melanchthon. No fewer than seven Jesuits were involved in various ways in writing it between 1550 and 1555, but Canisius was the first to conceive its form and contents on the basis of what he had learned in daily teaching-a task toward which Morone too had directed him. Canisius would remain a valuable contact for Morone: both as a

source of information on German affairs, especially after Morone was appointed president of the congregation for Germany established by Pius V, when relations between the Inquisition and the Society were also becoming "normalized";[251] and as a direct collaborator when Morone was once again sent to Germany as legate to the Diet of Regensburg in 1576.[252]

It was therefore amid the crucial events of 1540-42 that the relationship of esteem and trust between Morone and the first followers of Ignatius took shape. It would grow stronger in later years, embrace other members of the Society, including Loyola himself, endure throughout Morone's life, and lead him to undertake many interventions on their behalf. In 1543, for example, Pope Farnese, at Ignatius's urging, enforced in Rome the decree issued by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which forbade physicians to treat the sick until a priest had heard their confessions. The order aroused the opposition of Roman doctors, but Morone immediately promulgated it in Modena.[253]

When, early in 1546, Paul III ordered that several Jesuits be sent to the recently opened council, Loyola chose Favre because of his closeness to Morone. In the event Salmeron and Lainez reached Trent as papally appointed theologians, with the additional tasks of caring for the spiritual needs of the council fathers and their households and tending the city's poor and sick. Soon afterward the two Jesuits, joined by Le Jay as procurator for Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, bishop of Augsburg, became involved in the assembly's work, debating alongside the theologians and making an important contribution to the formulation of the decrees. Their positions were not always identical, although the Society's later historiography would promote the image of a united Jesuit body firmly aligned at Trent with Rome.[254] While their substantial fidelity to papal policy remained constant throughout the council, Lainez was very cautious concerning Contarini's doctrine of double justification and Salmeron abstained, in accordance with Ignatius's instruction that Jesuits remain neutral on questions dividing Catholics.[255]

A few years later, in 1555, when Morone left Rome bearing the legatine cross for the Diet of Augsburg, Girolamo Nadal and Giacomo Lainez accompanied him as papal theologians.[256] His new German mission raised great hopes among the Society's leaders. Loyola quickly communicated the news to numerous confreres, including Canisius, and openly expressed his conviction that the legate would negotiate as effectively as possible for the assignment to Jesuit colleges of the revenues of abandoned German monasteries, "because he is very devoted to our affairs for the glory of God, a great patron and supporter, and by nature most inclined to every good work, especially in Germany."[257]

Nadal's extreme rigidity toward the Protestants at Augsburg, however, created some tension with Morone, who rebuked him during a dinner at his residence for the excessive harshness of his words.[258] The legate had to hurry back to Rome at the end of March after the death of Julius III. Loyola then wrote to Nadal that "the good cardinal, who is entirely ours,"[259] had returned to Italy "very pleased with the Society."[260] In the autumn Ignatius met the cardinal again to ask him to moderate the anti-Jesuit polemics of the Spanish Dominicans[261] and to receive his advice on how the Society's forces should be deployed in Germany.

In any case, Morone's journey to Augsburg at the beginning of 1555 enabled him to intervene with local princes on behalf of Jesuit educational institutions. On that occasion he discussed with the duke of Bavaria suitable arrangements for the colleges at Dillingen and Ingolstadt and considered-at Nadal's suggestion, though without excessive optimism-the possibility of drawing financial and intellectual resources from now-deserted local monastic institutions for the benefit of the German College in Rome.[262]

Chapter Three

"With Tact and Gentleness": Heresy in Modena

1. "I Found the Temporal and Spiritual Affairs of My Bishopric in Great Disorder"

The appointment of the barely twenty-year-old Giovanni Morone as bishop of Modena on April 7, 1529,[1] did not greatly surprise those in the Este microcosm who, more than a decade earlier, had known his father's temperament and the power he had wielded and still retained. Yet, as we have seen, the dispute with the duke then prevented him from taking possession of the diocese, forcing him to live on scant resources in Rome among the pope's household. He accompanied the pontiff to Bologna for his meetings

with Charles V at the end of 1529 and again in 1532. In March of that year, writing from Ferrara, Morone had been able to tell the duke of Milan that he had sent someone to "take possession of the bishopric with all the necessary formalities."[2] On May 22 he was in Milan, where he attended to the selection of the preacher for the following year's Lent, while complaining that the city's Conservators had not informed him of their initiatives.[3] He was ordained priest and consecrated bishop in Bologna, in the church of San Francesco, on January 12, 1533,[4] the same day on which he wrote to Ippolito d'Este to press for the implementation of what had been agreed concerning certain ecclesiastical benefices.[5]

Soon afterward he moved to Modena, where on January 28 he was finally able to take possession of the diocese. Two months later, on March 25, the feast of the Annunciation, he celebrated his first Mass in the cathedral of San Geminiano. The canons received him with elaborate ceremony "because he was an honorable gentleman of the Morone house of Milan, almost raised in this city." An elderly moralist, the notary Tommasino de' Bianchi known as Lancillotti, did not fail to note with some astonishment in his city chronicle that the arrival of this young man, "tall and of pleasing appearance," took place "without pomp," unlike in the past, when "bishops used to arrive on a white palfrey beneath a canopy." His liturgical style also appeared unusually spare from the outset: "He did not sing the vespers of Saint Geminiano, as had been said, but merely gave the blessing to the people while standing upon the altar."[6] The simplicity of the ceremony made plain his distance from the sumptuous display of rank and power customary on such occasions. The population could nonetheless admire the splendor with which the duke of Milan came to pay homage to the new bishop, entering the city on March 1, 1533, with "all his gentlemen dressed in black velvet, many soldiers dressed in blue, and forty-four horses."[7] The ties between the late grand chancellor's son and the Sforza court did not weaken in the following years, as shown by his frequent visits to Milan and the offices that Francesco II continued to entrust to him.

Long governed by absentee ordinaries, though they had participated in the alliances of the local nobility,[8] Modena was a wealthy diocese. The episcopal mensa would be valued at five thousand ducats in 1590, but most of its property lay in the territory administered by the podesta of Massa Finalese, who showed little diligence in enforcing the payment of rents agreed with the emphyteutic tenants; some of them even sold portions of the property without being dispossessed. Despite this, the office allowed Morone to test reforming initiatives that some bishops were developing in the 1530s, both in pastoral care and on the extremely delicate frontier of containing heresy, although the political duties assigned him by the pope required long and frequent absences. For this reason too he resigned the diocese in 1550. He would return as bishop from 1564 to 1571, but never ceased defending his rights as perpetual administrator. Thus in December 1560, when Pius IV granted the abbey of Frassinoro in commendam to his nephew Carlo Borromeo, Morone informed Alfonso II d'Este and asked him to intervene so that "my indult concerning Modena should not be prejudiced," by virtue of which he had shortly before conferred the abbey upon his own nephew Galeazzo.[9]

His correspondence with the duke of Milan reveals from the outset his conviction that episcopal authority had to be restored and defended against encroachment by other powers, whether secular or ecclesiastical. His membership in a distinguished family untouched by local conflicts and feuds made this easier. It played a decisive role in his willingness to reach an understanding with the Este duke so that, "with regard to the spiritual part of my office [...] a strong secular arm may be placed at my disposal whenever I request it," as he wrote to Francesco II Sforza on November 3, 1533.[10] "I found the temporal and spiritual affairs of my bishopric in great disorder," he had informed him shortly before, on October 14, insisting on the need for vigorous political support to meet the "need for extensive repair."[11] A year later, on November 16, 1534, after returning to Modena, he again asked for the duke's help in freeing himself from the constraints imposed by the Este authorities, which prevented him from confronting the many problems of a bishopric "so meager and so heavily burdened."[12]

His first experience of pastoral government concentrated on restoring discipline and morality among the clergy, although he did not yet address the grave question of training priests who often lacked even the most elementary religious knowledge. Shortly after celebrating his first Mass, at the end of March 1533, the young bishop summoned the city's priests and admonished them to fulfill their religious duties and observe the liturgical rites, to conform their conduct to them, and to obey rules disregarded for decades. Otherwise, he warned, they would be punished "with the rod of Holy Mother Church and with monetary

penalties."[13] Yet that rod often proved insufficient, and Morone had to seek the intervention of secular power. On December 31, 1535, for example, he asked the duke to punish severely certain murderous priests who scandalized the city.[14] This first "attempt at disciplinary and moral restoration"[15] nevertheless remained episodic. Early in May 1533 Morone left for Milan, promising to return after a month, but his absence lasted until October 6.[16] Upon his return he announced a visitation of eighteen city churches, beginning at the end of November. It revealed a disastrous situation, as in the parish of San Michele, entrusted for decades to Don Guglielmo Campana, whose magical practices, poised between the sacred and the diabolical, had contaminated the entire city.[17]

It proved especially difficult to impose his authority on women's convents, accustomed to a long-standing lawlessness tenaciously defended through the ties connecting many nuns to the city's most prominent families. Only a few days after his first Mass Morone "had the rooms in which the sisters of San Geminiano outside Santa Caterina lived broken up, so that they could not go wandering about as they were accustomed to do in former times." A few days later he returned, demanded the keys to every room, searched them, and ordered "all the belongings carried into a single heap and entrusted to the abbess." Seeking to curb the disorderly life established in the convent, he commanded "under pain of excommunication" that the nuns live communally "and not separately as they had done," and further ordered "that they not go to their parlor to chatter with the female peddlers who came every day to speak with them." He also carried out an initial pastoral visitation of other monasteries, convents, "chapels, and other pious places in Modena."[18] The settlement of the nuns of San Geminiano would continue to concern him, as shown by letters to Duke Ercole II seeking fines against relatives and outsiders who spread slanders about his actions, interfered in the convent's management, and tried on "frivolous" grounds to appoint the nuns' spiritual directors.[19]

The attempt to reform the hospital of San Lazzaro had a more openly civic character. From it radiated the welfare system through which the city struggled to confront endemic social and health emergencies made dramatic by war, plague, and famine. It is hardly surprising that hospitals became surrounded by networks of personal and property interests involving syndics, deputies, and administrators, networks not easily broken. Lancillotti recorded the matter in abundant detail in connection with San Lazzaro. There Morone personally found that the poor housed in the institution "were not well treated, especially because they were given sour wine to drink." He clashed sharply with the administrators, who refused to show him the statutes "because they observe almost none of them, especially those concerning confession and communion at least four times a year, the visitation of the place, and the distribution of its income." The next day he therefore summoned the "superiors" of the confraternity responsible for the hospital, including members of the Castelvetro, Grillenzoni, and Cortese families. He told their representatives plainly, though "with a pleasant expression, that he had heard of the bad government of the said hospital and [...] exhorted them to observe due order for soul and body, and for the honor and benefit of the said hospital."[20]

These signs of a will to reform from below and from the periphery, made concrete by the bishop's determination to reside in his diocese, invite comparison with the visitations carried out in the diocese of Verona between 1525 and 1527 by the vicar and suffragan of Gian Matteo Giberti, reviving a tradition interrupted by the death of Ermolao Barbaro in 1471. In 1529 Giberti began a series of visitations conducted personally, starting with the cathedral. They served as a model for Morone's visitations a few years later, as indicated by the fact that the questionnaire drawn up by the bishop of Verona in 1530 survives among the papers of the bishop of Modena and was undoubtedly sent to him at his request.[21]

It cannot be established whether the practices of sound pastoral administration adopted by the two bishops were connected with the principles already expressed in Gasparo Contarini's *De officio viri boni et probi episcopi*, written in 1517. That work emphasized the bishop's political and social role, the need for his religious and canonical preparation, his moral duties, and the careful selection of both secular and regular clergy. It urged bishops to supervise them constantly and, when necessary, reduce them to obedience through visitations and synods, eliminating disorders in convents and monasteries-especially women's houses-withdrawn from episcopal jurisdiction.[22] In the diocese of Milan, from which Morone came, synods and provincial councils had disappeared centuries earlier, and monasteries had depended on the Roman curia since the mid-fourteenth century. Yet records survive of several Ambrosian pastoral visitations conducted in the fifteenth century by the bishop or his vicars, who kept the tradition alive even

during the decades when the two Este ordinaries were absent.[23] It is therefore reasonable to suppose that this tradition too led Morone to look to Giberti's example in combating clerical abuses, promoting a renewal of lay religious life, and reabsorbing the growing heretical dissent.

As everywhere in Italy, endemic ills afflicted the ecclesiastical institution in Modena, beginning with the cathedral chapter. Its management of the cathedral fabric and its considerable property had created a tangle of interests among the canons and the wealthy families from which most of them came. Often holding multiple benefices and rights of patronage, they formed "a narrow oligarchy, jealous of its prerogatives." They were divided internally into bitter factions, sometimes intertwined with the savage feuds that bloodied the city, but united both in the *corruptela haeternum observata* deplored as early as 1532 by the upright diocesan vicar Gian Domenico Sigibaldi and in resisting the bishop's authority. For this reason too, they were not immune to sympathy for heresies from beyond the Alps.[24]

The catalogue of the Church's evils was endless: parish priests who did not reside but merely enjoyed their benefices, leaving the care of souls to poorly paid chaplains, sometimes overbearing and corrupt; widespread poverty among the lower clergy, which not infrequently led to forbidden conduct such as alienating ecclesiastical property, engaging in illicit trade, and demanding money for funerals and sacraments. To these were added ignorance of the most elementary theological ideas and liturgical norms; the complete absence of clerical decorum in dress, a matter on which Morone had already intervened in 1533; negligence in celebrating rites; the deplorable condition of sacred buildings and furnishings; superstitious cults and dangerous mixtures of the sacred and the magical; concubinage, often accompanied by children; gambling, drunkenness, the carrying of weapons, violence, and the code of silence. Such behavior became still more grave and deeply rooted in the countryside and mountains, where the interference and arbitrary power of feudal lords were especially strong. Then there was the multitude of city monasteries and convents, particularly women's houses, exempt from episcopal authority and devoid of discipline, in part because of the "many kinships, friendships, and favors" enjoyed by the leading families at the court of Ferrara.[25]

Conversely, Morone could never rely on the special prerogatives that Giberti had obtained from Rome, which enabled the latter to act vigorously even against the regular clergy. The bishop's own jurisdiction was highly uncertain. He was often forced to compromise with the Este duke or endure interference by Roman tribunals, where privileges, revocations, and absolutions were not hard to obtain. As Sigibaldi complained early in 1541, "for money one can obtain from Rome permission to do whatever one wishes."[26]

The scarcity of documentation makes it impossible to reconstruct the situation in detail, although the records of post-Tridentine visitations present a desolate picture.[27] It is enough to read what remains of the correspondence between Morone and his vicar in the early 1540s to see how increasingly anxious reports of the spread of heresy mingled with reports of growing misery. "We abound in poor people who go begging, and in those who remain at home in extreme poverty, naked and sick," Sigibaldi wrote, for example, on January 20, 1541. He described the deplorable conduct of certain priests, "full of poison, who with that seasoning devour Christ every day"; the avarice of the cathedral chapter, "destroyers, not to say administrators," of its property, unwilling to give the poor even "a farthing"; and its members, almost all "grossly ignorant," who scandalized the faithful during processions by "wandering here and there without order," as he insisted on March 1.

Once again denouncing "the very slight devotion of our priests," Sigibaldi informed the distant bishop that "the clerics' school has never been worse governed." Its pupils consisted only of "certain ragged little scoundrels of seven or eight years, sons of beggars who have nothing to live on and must themselves go begging," with the result that "the church is served very badly." The usual greed of the canons, who had "divided the offices among themselves," had reduced the school to "such degradation." "I can say no more, for it turns my stomach," he concluded. "When Your Most Reverend Lordship returns, you will have to use something other than gentle words with these asses who need the stick."[28]

A month later the vicar's anger was aroused by "certain great louts of friars from San Francesco and Sant'Agostino, who in confession steal souls from Christ by inviting them to lust; and the monastery of San Francesco has become a brothel, so that I have been informed that only two friars are decent men: the rest is sheer lechery." During services in choir the canons spent their time chatting, when they were not dozing.

Many of them, disregarding the bishop's orders, wanted "to restore the chapel of polyphonic singing" in the cathedral. It transformed a rite of prayer into a frivolous spectacle and was a constant source of disorder because "it nourishes discord, dissipates the saint's treasury, weakens devotion, makes the choir negligent, and gives its members occasion to chatter, while the organ on one side and the singers on the other weary even the seats."

The protest was led by another member of the chapter, Giacomo Cortese the Younger, who had "returned from Rome diseased and ill mannered,"[29] but armed with a papal bull before which the vicar eventually had to yield: "I drank it down-indeed swallowed it with gall; blessed be God." The submission must have cost him all the more because Cortese, ignoring admonitions and reprimands, continued to pay a chaplain in a mountain village who kept "his concubine with two daughters in the church house. They are at the disposal of a man who was formerly a servant of the Cortesi and is now the tenant of that church; he lives in the same house and has children by those daughters of the chaplain, so that the priest's house has been turned into a public brothel. [...] How long, O Lord?" the furious Sigibaldi burst out.[30]

Two weeks later, on April 21, he had to inform Morone that in the church of Sant'Agostino "a scoundrel with huge legs, pretending to have been miraculously cured," had laid his crutches beneath a painted crucifix to which he attributed his recovery and had set up a "business" collecting offerings with the prior's complicity. The prior, ignoring the order to drive the rascal from the church so as not to encourage popular "superstition," went about saying that "many have received the grace of healing from various illnesses, and therefore he wishes to wait and see." To resolve the matter Sigibaldi would have to ask the governor to intervene.[31] The following day he returned to the attack, this time complaining about another extremely young canon, "the most dissolute ass in the clergy, shameless, fearless, and devoid of devotion."[32]

Meanwhile poverty continued to draw into the city an ungovernable mass of "poor beggars and so many male and female vagabonds that they are a disgrace, [...] the reproach of every creature-indeed the very sewer." It had become necessary to pay someone to drive them out of the cathedral, "where day and night they made a stable, a brothel, and a dung heap," he wrote on April 28. "Healthy young men and scabby, syphilitic wenches, and the like, steal, prostitute the little vagabonds, blaspheme, gamble, act as pimps, and, to put it briefly, commit every evil, so that even the galleys would not be a punishment worthy of them."[33] If one looked toward the Apennines, the condition of the Modenese Church appeared still worse. "Unruly priests," sometimes actual brigands who went unpunished, abounded; the phenomenon assumed alarming proportions in places under the episcopal jurisdiction of Nonantola, where, as Sigibaldi wrote to Morone on June 3, 1541, there were said to be "more than twenty clerics aged twenty or thereabouts, badly trained, wholly secular, illiterate, the dregs of the world, idle and ostentatious." Meanwhile in Modena "the trade in Masses continues in the usual fashion; the clerical pupils are ill behaved, wretched, ragged, and badly brought up."[34]

A few days later Sigibaldi had to warn the bishop about a priest convicted of raping a young girl. He had escaped from prison and, after wandering between Parma and Reggio without abandoning his crimes-"everywhere he has done the same things"-was finally banished from Sassuolo, where "he had conducted himself so perversely in dishonesty and then boasted of it, saying that carnal intercourse with women is no sin and saying so publicly in the inn; beating the parish priest [...] and throwing him down from the hayloft," before eventually attempting murder. Another priest, Galvano Castaldo, had succeeded in committing a premeditated murder and had taken refuge in Guastalla or Novellara. Yet another member of that powerful Modenese family, a young man whom the Dominicans had attempted to bring into their order, had "left the friary with surreptitiously obtained briefs and lives so dissolutely amid prostitutes, dances, blasphemies, display, and the like that I am ashamed." The relative who kept him in his house allowed it all, "because he has designs upon his property."[35]

To put an end to the crimes of clerics guilty of "enormous offenses," Morone could do nothing but call upon the secular arm. "Should Your Excellency know of others and be pleased to inform me of them, I shall willingly entrust their arrest to whatever officers you choose, because I desire that crimes be purged, scandals prevented, and the authority of the ecclesiastical tribunal preserved," Sigibaldi wrote to Ercole II on June 7, 1541.[36]

The catalogue of complaints, denunciations, anger, and frustration on the vicar's part summarized here comes from fewer than five months of correspondence with a bishop occupied at distant German diets. Even allowing for Sigibaldi's gruff rigorism, and perhaps for his inclination to aggravate matters, emphasize the worst cases, and present the situation as even more difficult than it really was, the catalogue still offers a painful image of the Modenese clergy and of the social complicities that protected its abuses.

Nor has anything yet been said about the gravest case, which continually recurs in the letters: Guidotto, the natural son of the canon Sisto Guidoni, and himself a priest. He had scandalously squandered the ecclesiastical property and revenues transmitted to him by his father, earning Lancillotti's stern contempt: "He was a whoremonger all his life, dressed entirely in silk, with fine horses in his stable and hunting dogs, and lived in the greatest dissolution."[37] Arrested and condemned by Morone in 1542, three years later he would again be imprisoned for theft. He managed to escape and turned to banditry, only to end up in the public hospital in 1549, barely thirty years old, suffering from syphilis, without a resource left, "badly dressed and still worse shod, so that he looks like a beggar, because none of those who helped him squander his money would give him a glass of water," the city chronicler noted with some satisfaction. Two years later he recorded Guidotto's miserable end: "The lice were eating him, and his pride ceased, together with gambling, pomp, and whores."[38] His name constantly appears in the correspondence between vicar and bishop, both intent on preventing the ecclesiastical revenues he held from being used merely to feed "dogs, whores, horses, display, pimps, and bawds."[39]

2. "The Constant Absence from the Church to Which I Am Bound Gnawed at My Soul"

As we shall see, in the summer of 1542 Morone unsuccessfully attempted to reabsorb the heretical dissent flourishing in his diocese.[40] Shortly before leaving for Germany to take part in the Diet of Speyer,[41] on September 10 he wished to leave the city clergy a set of rules on "how they were to conduct themselves in celebrating the offices devoutly, in silence and without disturbance; and when they were to celebrate Mass, they must have everything they needed; and other fine ordinances; and they were not to stroll about the church, under the penalties contained therein," as Lancillotti recorded on the eighteenth. Shortly afterward the chronicler was able to reproduce the full text of the document, which also required attendance throughout the entire rite and suitable dress. He praised the measure, "because people walk about in churches as they do in the square, and all the markets in the wickedness of this city are held there, especially while the divine offices are being celebrated-a thing the Jews do not do in their synagogues."[42]

Undoubtedly prompted by the deplorable habits of the Modenese priests that Morone had observed during his stay in the city, the ordinance remained confined to this single aspect, though it was of primary importance not only for bringing some order to the liturgy but above all for restoring episcopal authority and returning to the clergy a minimum of decorum and therefore respect from the laity.[43] It was still far from confronting as a whole the many abuses infesting the Modenese Church.

From this perspective Morone's decree appears very different from the detailed *Constitutiones* for the diocesan clergy that Giberti was then publishing in Verona, "the most systematic and substantial document" of his work of renewal, aimed not merely at disciplining the clergy but also at educating and instructing them.[44] It is likely, moreover, that the Milanese cardinal, summoned to new duties of the highest responsibility, had no time to become acquainted with that lengthy document, divided into more than 250 *capitula*, still less to reflect on it and translate it into the Modenese context, where clerical abuses were intertwined with the spread of heresy.

What limited his reforming action and confined it to sporadic and discontinuous interventions was the absence of the very foundation of the *gibertalis disciplina*: the bishop's residence. Morone was forced to rely largely on his industrious vicar. He could not create around himself a group of collaborators, a band of serious and well-trained ecclesiastics capable of giving substance and continuity to an organic project, supervising its implementation, and serving as examples in promoting a reform of the Church based on an overall renewal of religious life involving clergy and laity alike.[45] His residence in the diocese was never stable enough for him personally to lead a pastoral visitation. Only in the summer of 1542 did he summon "many parish priests from the mountains to examine them and see how fit they were to perform their office."[46] Morone could do little more. When he returned to Modena in the spring of 1543, after the failure

to convene the council, he would bring with him a new and different religious sensibility, no longer reducible to that model but marked by new doctrinal orientations.

Yet he never ceased to view the diocese partly as an unresolved problem, an obligation unfulfilled, and partly with satisfaction that he had administered it "perhaps with greater diligence and devotion, let this be said without boasting, than had been done in that city for many years before." He recalled the rigor with which he had administered confirmation and admitted "very few to the priesthood," taking care to ascertain that they "were well instructed, [...] possessed adequate learning, and had some title or patrimony."[47] After entrusting the administration of episcopal property to a procurator, the Ferrarese Ludovico Bussani, the bishop was also able to introduce certain reforms from afar.[48]

On February 27, 1536, for example, in order to combat the custom of wearing masks on Carnival Sunday-a source of numerous disorders involving many clerics who seized the opportunity for amusement-Morone summoned the city priests "and begged them not to go masked as worldly men do, but to preserve their rank and the honor of the clergy. They promised to do so, and indeed one does not hear that they go out masked; and if they do, they do so cautiously."[49] In 1537-38 he promoted a radical reform of liturgical music, banning polyphony in the same spirit that would lead Girolamo Seripando to intervene among the nuns of Santa Monica in Rome in the 1540s and Ludovico Beccadelli to address the issue in preparation for the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent.[50] This aspect of Morone's reforming activity, little studied until now although it was one cause of the Modenese canons' opposition,[51] also seems to evoke his Ambrosian roots.[52]

During his German nunciatures, as we have seen, Morone had developed a political irenicism that was progressively strengthened by the awareness that no unity of purpose would be possible without some doctrinal agreement on the foundations of the Christian faith. Yet it is important to remember that this irenicism was grafted onto the "everyday religion" of his forebears, his father's hard schooling, his experience of the errors in the political and religious strategies of Clement VII's papacy, and his knowledge of the women and men with whom he had formed relationships in preceding years.

It is significant that in November 1539 he summoned the Capuchins to Modena. This new Franciscan congregation had obtained recognition from Clement VII and Paul III only through the support of the Colonna, the Gonzaga, and Caterina Cibo, and was still viewed with suspicion. Morone was among the first to receive them. He lodged them in the bishop's palace and entrusted them with teaching the catechism to children, directing the small orphanage of San Bernardino, and providing spiritual care for the sick at the hospital of San Giobbe.[53] It was also from that first, though brief, pastoral experience that he drew the premises with which, as papal nuncio, he confronted the spread of heresy in the German world, the disintegration of the *respublica christiana*, and the collapse of every form of authority and prestige possessed by the Church of Rome, whose interests and dignity he was called to defend within Germany's political and religious labyrinth.

The young Milanese nuncio repeatedly asked to return to Italy, not only to face his family troubles but also to continue reform in his diocese. Writing to the cardinal of Santa Fiora from Ghent on March 21, 1540, "weary of toil and continual journeys and desirous of serving God with a quieter spirit and fulfilling my duty toward the church entrusted to me," he had already expressed growing discomfort at neglecting his pastoral obligations, all the more pressing because serious problems disturbed religious life in Modena. The time had now come to confront them, especially since "the hope that any fruit can be produced in Germany in the matter of religion" had vanished. Hence his repeated pleas to return to Italy and his request that the pope grant him "greater opportunity and authority to govern my bishopric for the benefit of souls," as Giberti had obtained:[54]

> The constant absence from my church, to which I am bound, gnawed at my soul, for I knew that there are many errors within it, to the dishonor of God and the ruin of souls. Although it does not lie within my power to remedy them entirely, since I have so little knowledge and authority and encounter many obstacles from superior magistrates, both ecclesiastical and secular, nevertheless with God's help I could have taken some measures to prevent them from multiplying, as they have done and continue to do without cease.

Less than a month later, on April 18, he again commended to the vicar "the spiritual and temporal affairs of the bishopric," not because he doubted Sigibaldi's "faith, diligence, and prudence," but because "I cannot restrain myself," he wrote, "from expressing in words what is continually in my mind, and while I write my anxiety is greatly calmed."[55] The previous day, although aware that this was hardly the best moment to withdraw from the turbulent German front, he had appealed to Paul III;[56] and on June 3, from Hagenau, he asked Aleandro's support for his return to Italy at the end of the diet, "once the direction of affairs has been seen." "Your Most Reverend Lordship should know that, by God's grace, this idea of mine has roots more tenacious and deeper than can easily be torn out."[57]

He would return to the subject every month, but in vain,[58] for Pope Farnese had no intention whatever of depriving himself of Morone's valuable services. It was therefore useless for him to insist from Regensburg on February 7, 1541, upon his desire to live "with a more contented spirit,"[59] even with Contarini's support. A month later the cardinal emphasized that the bishop of Modena had "accepted this burden in order to obey Our Lord, to whose service he is wholly devoted; but it has seemed to him a heavy charge and he would not have wished it imposed upon him."[60]

It is difficult to say, at this date, how much his request was shaped by exhaustion, discomfort, the heavy burden of responsibility at exceedingly delicate moments, the constant demands of a public role, and distance from home, and how much by pastoral concern for his long-neglected diocese. Yet eloquent evidence of the latter emerges from his correspondence. In a letter to Farnese from Vienna on December 2, 1539, for example, he thanked him for intervening to free him from Cardinal d'Este's pension, as he had always requested "for the benefit of the [...] church and of those in need of that money," while expressing the hope that sooner or later his merits would be recognized.[61] A few months after leaving Italy, from Breslau in June 1537, he had already requested his recall on account of Modenese affairs,[62] "because in truth they are in extreme need," he insisted a year later.[63] In his letter of March 21, 1540, to the cardinal of Santa Fiora, as we have seen, he expressed the desire to "fulfill my duty."

Less than two months later, on May 8, after learning that his recall would again be delayed,[64] the nuncio declared himself ready to obey the pope, especially in view of the delicacy of the approaching religious colloquies. "If His Holiness is to have ministers there," he wrote with some pride, "I do not think it inappropriate-given the little knowledge I possess of German affairs-that I should be among them." Yet he again appealed to the cardinal of Santa Fiora for a guarantee that his return would not be further postponed. The spread of heresy in Modena made it necessary, and demanded energetic measures from Rome. Morone had sent Cervini a detailed memorandum explaining the gravity of the situation:[65]

> And so that His Holiness may know that I have not sought my return without very good reason, Your Most Reverend Lordship should know that I have been informed through various channels from Modena that the city contains the worst beginnings of heresy. People speak publicly of purgatory, indulgences, the Mass, the intercession of the saints, the pope's authority, free will, and other articles in the same manner as among the Lutherans. The sowers of these tares are exceedingly cunning, cautious, and learned, and it is already found that they have gained a strong foothold and much support. As bishop I therefore make this known to His Holiness and beg him to provide a remedy by sending proper inquisitors and suitable persons from Rome, [...] because far greater fires have been kindled in Germany from much smaller beginnings, and if this plague took root in Italy it might bring still greater ruin than it has in Germany.

The following day Morone also wrote to the vicar, urging him to discuss with Cervini "the beginnings of the heresies now appearing, which, if not corrected, might produce great evil, since a vast fire has been seen to blaze up from far feebler beginnings." He told him to watch the preachers carefully, especially the Augustinians: "You know I have always mistrusted those of that order." "An inquisition into the heretics," he concluded, "pleases me greatly, but it must be carried out by prudent, learned, and energetic men who possess the strength to execute it; otherwise no good effect would follow, and indeed authority would be lost."[66]

Nevertheless, despite his repeated and sometimes embittered insistence, Morone had to remain in Germany for several more months. "This has been contrary to all my expectations and contrary to both need and will," he informed Modena on November 1.[67] Long letters sent once or twice a week by his vicar

kept him informed of an increasingly difficult situation, caused above all by a clergy rebellious against all discipline and immersed in a murky swamp of abuse and violence. Added to this were the encroachments of the civil authorities, poor harvests and poverty, the immoral conduct of laypeople, and a thousand other problems for which the bishop tried to provide from afar: distributing alms, arranging shipments of grain from Germany, attempting to suppress gambling, and curbing the lawlessness of Carnival by prohibiting the manufacture of masks.[68]

What chiefly disturbed the vicar's sleep, however, was the spread of heretical doctrines, especially among the learned and powerful, who were able to construct around themselves a network of solidarity and protection. For a substantial period, from October 1540 to June 1541, many of these letters have survived, offering striking glimpses of the rooting of heresy in the Emilian city. Without support from the Roman and Ferrarese authorities, Morone tried in vain to oppose it with the fragile barrier of his recommendations and reprimands. These letters deserve to be examined, for they reveal not only one reason for the bishop's increasingly urgent requests to return to Italy, but also the premise of the attempt he would make in the summer of 1542 to reabsorb religious dissent.

3. Modena as Prague

On October 26, 1540, for example, Sigibaldi reported Countess Lucrezia Rangoni's rejoicing at the return to Modena of Don Girolamo Teggia, whom she received into her house and entrusted with the education of her son Fulvio.[69] He also described the "close association" Teggia immediately formed with Bonifacio Valentini, provost of the cathedral and leader of a group of canons hostile to the bishop and ready to give their opposition a more or less pronounced heterodox coloring. Though outwardly presenting himself as "reconciled," Valentini continued to be "regarded as a perfect Lutheran." He had "set himself to studying the New Testament, having it read to him by certain foreigners reputed to be Lutherans, who as recently as this past Lent went from one workshop to another, from one man to the next, suborning them with those stale Lutheran matters, so that this city has become greatly infamous for it."

Teggia and Valentini were not alone in allowing "now with one person, now with another, some Lutheran fragments to slip from their mouths." The entire group known as the Academicians-led by Filippo Valentini, Don Giovanni Bertari, and Niccolo Machella-had intervened on behalf of Camillo Renato, who had fled Bologna and been arrested in Modenese territory while "going about subverting the peasants." "This scoundrel does not lack intercessors," among them the powerful Count Ercole Rangoni, Sigibaldi complained, promising himself that he would "make some demonstration in order to restrain these fools, who think that they alone understand the Gospel." Renato had been arrested, but another man, "also a foreigner," the mysterious Giorgio Filalete known as the Turk-an Anabaptist and anti-Trinitarian who "performed the same Lutheran office"-had managed to escape. He was "very dear to these Academicians" and "went to teach the Gospel to Messer Bonifacio." The "dance has now begun," the vicar concluded, hoping it might end "well, with the correction of these Lutheranizers, who, as far as I can understand, aim to destroy ecclesiastical and papal authority and power, which does not consist in morals, as they suppose."[70]

Only a month and a half later, on December 7, Morone was able to answer this letter from Worms, where he had arrived on November 27 and where every prospect of agreement had immediately appeared exceedingly remote, "partly because of the adversaries' obstinate attachment to perverse dogmas and to the destruction of the ancient-indeed the true-religion, partly because of the unfavorable character of the times, not to say the ill will of the great princes." Yet amid these "public troubles," what worried him most was what was happening in his distant diocese: "the danger to that city from these new sects." He urged Sigibaldi to keep his eyes open "so that these beginnings may be uncovered, for I fear they are already too deeply rooted; but you should know that from a smaller spark than this the great fire of Germany was kindled." Fortunately Rome had assured him that after the Diet of Regensburg he would be able to return to Italy. He intended to do so in any event, even without permission, "not only because of the affairs of the bishopric, but also because I am sated and weary from so many journeys, labors, and dangers to mind and body."[71]

On November 10 Sigibaldi again had to write about Renato's case. To demonstrate the obstacles frustrating his attempts to restrain "such license against ecclesiastical dogmas and institutions," he enclosed

the Este duke's reply to his letter "concerning the Lutheran sect." The duke ordered him not to proceed "to the publication of any proclamations," in order to avoid scandal and clamor.[72] "God will provide for them, since His ministers will not or cannot," the vicar commented. "This entire city, according to common report, is stained and infected by the contagion of different heresies, like Prague. In workshops, street corners, houses, and everywhere else, everyone-so I hear-debates faith, free will, purgatory and the Eucharist, predestination." He said he could do nothing but "pray that God deliver this people from such pestilence," and was all the more "saddened" because "there is no one who comes to testify and no one who shows zeal for Christ."[73] Soon afterward it was even said in Naples that "almost all Modena held to justification."[74]

Such reports led Morone once again to appeal to Cervini and Farnese.[75] On December 27, 1540, he expressed to the latter his grave disappointment at the silence that had met his requests either to return to the diocese or at least to take effective action against the "beginnings of the worst heresies" discovered there. The matter demanded the utmost speed, beginning with strict control over preaching. His purpose was not to usurp "authority over the friars by this means," but to confront grave and imminent dangers. Yet this was not enough: it was necessary "to investigate more deeply and go to the root of the evil, which I fear is founded in a place of greater importance than Modena," by sending from Rome "discreet, faithful, and learned men for the Inquisition, with full authority to perform their office." Above all it was necessary to act quickly, "because if the fine minds and good learning of that city, with some external assistance, were to become established in evil, as perhaps they intend, the damage would be irreparable, and within a short time news of it would be heard everywhere."[76]

> In the meantime, the vicar continued, these evil plants have continually taken deeper root and spread their branches, so that I am told that in Prague in Bohemia there is not as much discussion of every heresy as in Modena. In the shops people speak against purgatory, against the Mass, against ecclesiastical authority, against the invocation of the saints, and against other articles just as they do in Germany. Among others there have been certain preachers from Sant'Agostino, of the order to which Martin Luther belonged, who deceitfully and with great skill have scattered evil seed throughout the city. Certain persons inclined toward the sect were asking for those preachers again and employed the city's Conservators to obtain them. Your Most Reverend and Illustrious Lordship should know that this evil has a stronger foundation than people think, and I fear that little by little it will spread so far that it will become incurable.

The papal brief granting Sigibaldi the power to forbid anyone to preach without his authorization was dispatched from Rome on January 31, 1541, together with an exhortation to do everything possible to uproot "that evil seed" and a promise to take further action if it should be considered useful.[77] For the moment, however, nothing changed, and during the winter of 1540-41 the news from Modena became increasingly alarming. Don Domenico Morando[78] informed the bishop of the heterodox propaganda Teggia was also conducting in the parish church of San Giacomo in the Cremonese territory.[79] Following Morone's instructions, Sigibaldi appealed to Cervini to press for the bishop's return, required by "the most urgent causes concerning the honor of God and the salvation of this his flock."[80]

Two days later, on January 20, the vicar sent Morone a long letter reporting the latest developments, especially Renato's abjuration at Bologna and Sigibaldi's own conversation with Teggia, the "heresy-chief, standard-bearer, and first-ranking soldier." He had sternly admonished him to abandon "these Lutheran innovations" and "every association, especially with those who, under the title of piety and Christian freedom, despise Masses, sermons, and every ecclesiastical institution." Teggia had responded evasively with "a chaos of words." He admitted "having been somewhat incautious in speaking with uneducated persons, who did not understand what he said," and "knowing the scriptural passages concerning these articles debated by the modern heretics, but keeping them buried within himself; he neither says nor will say anything, although he thinks it very wrong that he cannot charitably say what he believes and what he draws from the Gospel of Saint Paul."[81] Although able to find his way through Teggia's reticence and ambiguities, Sigibaldi did not conceal from the bishop his deep skepticism about the results of this paternal admonition.

Before long the vicar had to return to the subject. "The sect continues to persist and multiply, but no one comes forward to denounce it," he wrote on March 1. The sermons "against these new heresies" delivered in Modena by the Jesuit Giacomo Lainez had served only to provoke further controversy. Meanwhile Bonifacio Valentini, at the head of a band of canons and now universally known "as a Lutheran," busied himself "removing the prayers to the saints said after vespers and the *Salve*." As soon as Sigibaldi attempted to use the brief allowing him to authorize preaching only in the cathedral, an uproar erupted, with influential citizens intervening forcefully in defense of the Augustinian whose suspicious sermons had prompted the measure.[82]

At the same time Don Giovanni Bertari was publicly commenting on the letters of Saint Paul in the Molza house, arousing "great suspicion," and showing "intimacy [...] with those of the sect." Among them were the physician Gabriele Falloppia, who "is becoming thoroughly steeped in these heresies"; Teggia, now forgetful of the earlier warning; Machella; and all the other "new evangelists, forgetful of Christ and not enamored of Him as they pretend. [...] Very many eat meat on Fridays and Saturdays; they do not pray or fast, and so forth. What a great abomination!"

On February 28 the vicar had to appeal to the duke, asking the governor to enforce the papal brief that the Augustinians, strong in broad city support, refused to obey.[83] In this difficult situation a shaft of light came from the sermon preached that very day by the famous Bernardino Ochino, who was passing through Modena. He "left in this curious people, as many as the cathedral could hold, such confidence, love, and devotion in Christ that he made two hundred men of marble weep, so that everyone longs for him. [...] I am certain," the vicar wrote, revealing the profound contradictions within which he himself moved, "that the Lord God would uproot these heresies if that Capuchin were to preach here." He therefore suggested that the bishop make every effort to secure Ochino's longer presence in Modena the following year,[84] when, as is well known, Ochino would flee to Geneva to escape a summons from the Roman Holy Office.

Ercole II's intervention brought that incident to an end,[85] but little more than a month later the Bertari affair erupted. He had become "the talk of the common people" because his Pauline readings drew an ever larger audience, before whom he had begun "to seal predestination [...] in the minds of his listeners," provoking "the greatest murmuring." As Sigibaldi reported to Morone on April 4, 1541, the Modenese priest had continued his lectures, disregarding every admonition, lashing out "with canine tooth now against the pope, now against prelates, priests, and friars," and advocating impious doctrines, until the Dominican inquisitor was forced to intervene. Proceedings began amid protests and pressure from powerful citizens accompanied even by "artisans" and "commoners." Bertari was formally summoned, but left for Rome, where he could rely on influential protection.

For the moment Bonifacio Valentini seemed "entirely reformed." Teggia too, with whom the vicar had again held "various and lengthy discussions of the dogmas now called into doubt," appeared to show "a very good disposition, so that, if he holds a contrary judgment in his heart, I consider him a perfect heretic. [...] He has the passages of Scripture ready for every question."[86] Two days later the vicar supplied further details about the Bertari affair. Publication of his excommunication had opened a bitter conflict between the inquisitor and the canons led by Valentini. Some openly defended Bertari against the "foolishness" of his accusers, saying: "We are free, and not as the ignorant think." The controversy spread, while Bertari attacked vows and fasts "because these things are not found written in the Gospel," so that in the houses of Camillo Molza, Filippo Valentini, Niccolo Machella, "and many others, meat is eaten every day without any difference or distinction for Lent, Friday, or Saturday."

Morone's own name had now become entangled in the affair, because some were asking, "What will the bishop do now, since he thought so highly of this Don Giovanni? Can it be that he did not know he was a heretic?" The vicar was forced into embarrassing explanations. Bertari's disciples and the Academicians were tending to form a single group, joined by several women who were ready to conduct insinuating propaganda in the women's convents. "These members of the sect here are worse than the Lutherans," Sigibaldi finally exploded, "because I think I understand that they have embraced all the German heresies." He hoped the bishop would return quickly to remedy such confusion.[87]

But in his reply, dated Regensburg, April 18, Morone could communicate only his "great sorrow" over the Bertari case, "seeing that these innovations multiply every day." He again urged careful vigilance, "so

that, if the evil can be uncovered on sound grounds, a suitable remedy may be sought; and I am certain that nothing will be lacking from Rome's side."[88] Such hopes, however, could not alter the situation, which seemed to worsen day by day. Bad news also arrived from the parish church of San Giacomo in Cremonese territory, where shots had been fired inside the church amid constant violence by "deviants" who abstained from confession and communion.

On the twenty-first Sigibaldi repeated that "the sect continues, as I hear, to persist, and the lord duke takes no action. I do believe that, if some guilty person were denounced to him, he would bestir himself. But no one wishes to become an informer, either to me or to the inquisitor."[89] A week later he insisted: "Sermons and public lectures are of no use in restraining the vain opinions of this sect. *Nolunt intelligere ut bene agant* [They refuse to understand, that they may do good]. The only remedy would be for the duke to lay the royal hand upon one of them and punish him as an example to the others." Nothing moved in this direction. On the contrary, the Academicians spread the report that Bertari had been absolved in Rome "and had obtained a brief permitting him to preach and lecture."[90]

On May 3 Morone again expressed his great sorrow over "so grave a case." He repeated that "it will be less harmful for such a sickness to be uncovered than for it, while hidden, to infect that whole church," and that it was necessary to reach "the root of the evil without regard for anyone." This time, however, he could also offer a glimmer of hope arising from developments at the Diet of Regensburg: "Another article on justification has now been agreed, which carries many consequences with it; [...] I firmly believe that these conclusions will also benefit the other provinces, and especially Italy and our Church of Modena."[91] He therefore enclosed the text of article five of the *Concordia Ratisbonensis*, "on the justification of man."

Morone had already been alert to the possible pastoral consequences of the religious colloquies. From Worms he had sent Modena the formula of agreement on original sin and, through the vicar, sought the opinion of several clerics, among them Bertari, who replied with evasive caution.[92] Sigibaldi hoped above all that the conclusion of the diet would allow the bishop's immediate return to Italy, so that he could "labor sooner among this his flock than elsewhere"-in Modena, where even among the Academicians the echoes of Regensburg were heard. "Concerning the articles treated at that diet," he wrote, "the sect here speaks as though it received letters every day, and from time to time they utter many absurdities against the approved dogmas, according to the opinions"

“which they hold or would like to hold,” he wrote on 11 May 1541.

While Bertari’s case was still unresolved, Teggia had resumed meeting with the Academicians, both openly and in secret. Bonifacio Valentini appeared devoted to studying Scripture and behaved “obediently,” yet his house served as a meeting place for “those of the sect. He willingly speaks about the articles called into question by the modern heretics. What lies hidden within, I do not know.” During religious ceremonies he was “restless and irreverent,” and “in conversation, in sermons, and even in the way he speaks, he makes himself highly suspect; if there were an inquisitor of authority here, I think he would be among the first to be reported.” The controversies over preaching were becoming ever fiercer, to the point that it was now “a great danger for able men to preach or lecture publicly in this city, where some go to one extreme and others to the opposite one concerning good works: some place too much trust in them, while others despise them altogether, saying they are superfluous and that Christ has merited everything for all, so that they themselves may remain idle.” Sigibaldi therefore awaited the outcome of the diet anxiously, hoping it would silence the heretics, “who feed on the hope - may it prove vain - that ecclesiastical authority will vanish into smoke and that, on the other articles, they will be free to do as they please, according to a carnal Christian liberty understood in their own fashion.” 93

Soon afterward, as we have seen, the nuncio would set out for Italy in the emperor’s retinue, accompanying him as far as Genoa. He then returned to Milan in October 1541 to attend to his household, while remaining constantly alert to the problems in Modena. 94 From Milan, in addition to requesting the right to confer benefices and the powers already granted by Paul III to Giberti, he asked - no doubt at Contarini’s suggestion - that the Modenese Benedictine Gregorio Cortese, then abbot of San Benedetto Po, be instructed “to investigate whether Lutheran or other heresies exist in his native city of Modena and, should they be found, to deal with them in whatever manner his prudence deems appropriate.” 95 Only after Morone returned to Rome at the end of November, however, and surely as a result of his insistence, did Paul III issue the brief of 10 December 1541 formally entrusting Cortese with that task. 96 Shortly afterward Cortese spent some time in Modena, where illness prevented him from accomplishing much, although he frequently met the governor and other leading citizens, 97 while keeping his attention fixed on the religious question in which he would again be involved in the future.

Thus, when Morone returned to his diocese, he was already well informed about the heresy in Modena. His long stay in Germany had enabled him to develop a strategy aimed at healing religious divisions through the council, reform of the curia, and a moderate attitude toward the Lutheran world - one open to cautious concessions, conciliatory policies, and flexible accommodations. The surviving sources do not allow us to follow adequately the first stage of this development, which began from cultural premises very different from Contarini’s: Morone’s training was legal and political rather than humanistic, philosophical, or theological. There can be no doubt, however, that their meeting and the bond of mutual esteem immediately formed between these representatives of two different generations laid the groundwork both for the essential role the great Venetian cardinal would soon play in Modenese affairs at Morone’s explicit request and, above all, for Morone’s own involvement in a new religious sensibility. 98 It is significant that the young nuncio who in 1540 had hoped that inquisitors would be sent to Modena returned there in 1542 convinced that the best means “for the eradication of heresies,” and for dealing with “those lost souls” and “those

powerful minds, for they were very obstinate, imagined themselves highly learned, and were supported by many family ties, friendships, and patrons at the court of the duke of Ferrara," 99 was to proceed with "kindness and trust" or, as he would still advise his successor Egidio Foscarari in 1550, "with sound doctrine, perseverance and patience, and every form of affection and charity." 100 With these premises and intentions, he and Contarini would attempt to put into practice a strategy capable of extinguishing that center of heresy, whose heat "was such that it warmed all Italy," as a religious exile would later write. 101

It is impossible to know whether, and to what extent, Morone shared the doctrinal formulas on justification that Contarini had proposed at Regensburg. The trial records reveal only that, on his return to Modena, when the inquisitor Domenico Adelasio expressed the opinion that the Venetian cardinal "had conceded too much to those Germans," Morone replied that "he had done so because it could be brought back to the meaning accepted by the Catholic Church." 102 In any event, Morone preserved among his papers a copy, personally given to him by Contarini, of the long letter the latter had addressed on 25 May 1541 to a trusted theologian of Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga in order to clarify the doctrine he had defended at the diet. 103 Still less is known of how Morone reacted to the accusations directed against the papal legate precisely because of that doctrine, which some cardinals regarded as ambiguous, if not openly heterodox. Morone was with him in Milan when, on 23 August 1541, Contarini addressed a bitter and indignant letter to Alessandro Farnese, complaining of the intolerable suspicions aroused against him upon his return to Italy, to the point that he was "treated as a Lutheran." 104 It was probably during those weeks spent side by side that the young nuncio's political irenicism began to be enriched and complicated by a religious sensibility. This included the desire to find means of offering credible answers to a widespread unease that in Modena found expression both in the heterodox doctrines of a Girolamo Teggia and in the anxieties of a poor "mountain priest." In the summer of 1542 Morone succeeded in freeing the latter from his anguished doubts as to "how God, being just, could show mercy toward sinners," explaining to him that "our sins deserved God's severe justice, but that for those who truly repented and confessed, and so forth, this justice was transformed into mercy through the love of Jesus Christ, who had suffered death on the cross to appease the Father and procure our salvation." 105

It is worth noting, in any case, that the first suspicions about Morone arose after his return to Modena in November 1541, during the few weeks in which he was able to reside there. According to Fra Domenico Adelasio, he had come back from Germany "off the true path, lightly dusted with, infected by Lutheran ideas," and even "completely corrupted." What scandalized the friar were Morone's criticisms of the way the friars recited the *Salve Regina*: he accused them of wishing "to make the glorious Virgin greater than Christ, whereas we must go to Christ and to God." 106 It was probably then, during Morone's journey toward Rome, that another Dominican spoke with him and came away with the impression that "in his conversations he had drunk somewhat of that Lutheran doctrine from Germany." 107

4. At the Diet of Speyer

Summoned to the curia after a short stay in Modena, 108 Morone set out for Rome on 23 November 1541. On the 26th, Alessandro Farnese informed the nuncio in Venice, Giorgio Andreasi, that the pope was determined to convene the council, but first had to wait "until the bishop of Modena returns to Germany, where he has already been assigned on account of the

reform to be carried out in that province," and to persuade the Germans to take part in the assembly of bishops. 109 Morone was to leave in great haste, but the torments of gout prevented him from departing before 10 December; he returned to Modena on the 20th by way of Siena. 110 On the 23rd the city's Este governor, Francesco Villa, informed the duke that "after the three Christmas feast days he will depart for Germany and stop at Speyer, for the diet that is to be held there." 111 That same day the cardinal-nephew notified Morone of his "dispatch" and sent him the instructions drafted by Contarini, 112 urging him to proceed as quickly as possible to Trent, where those documents reached him on 11 January, the day after his arrival. 113 He had left Modena on the 4th, "sick with gout," Lancillotti recorded, 114 after informing Ercole II d'Este of the possibility that the council might be convened at Ferrara. Morone nevertheless remained convinced that "no decision will be made until I write from Germany, because a large part of the difficulty lies in deciding whether it is to be held in Italy or in Germany," while in his own view "it could and should be held at Trent, notwithstanding the sterility and inconvenience of the place." 115 For the moment, therefore, the grave problems of the Modenese diocese remained unresolved. Although the dense correspondence with Sigibaldi is missing for these months, everything suggests that matters continued as before, with the vicar unable to confront, using adequate instruments, a situation that had now escaped his control.

Morone reached Trent on 10 January 1542, almost recovered from his ailments. 116 There he issued his first appeal for reform, an indispensable prerequisite for the council, warning the bishop and chapter of the danger of heresy and exhorting them "to abandon vice and draw near to the Christian path." 117 A week later, writing from Innsbruck, he informed Rome that another attack of illness was forcing him to travel in short stages. Racked with pain, he had "never been able to raise myself from my foot and feel all my sinews almost bound, as though the gout intended to seize me everywhere." Meanwhile, the religious condition of the territories through which he traveled continued to appear disastrous. For that reason too, so that he would have something concrete to show the German princes, he asked for a "copy of the reform that is to be carried out at court and throughout Italy, which is mentioned in the instructions, because with greater credibility we shall be able to urge this other reform." 118 On 25 January he reached Munich, where he exhorted Duke William of Bavaria to promote reform of the clergy, especially because in Germany "the people appeared to be becoming Lutherans in faith, taking occasion from the bad example of the Catholics." From there he went to Dillingen, the residence of Christoph von Stadion, the elderly bishop of Augsburg, a man "of sound intelligence, great experience, and the most learned among Germany's prince-bishops." The bishop did not conceal his pessimism. Twenty years earlier, he believed, reforms capable of stemming heresy might still have been undertaken, but no longer: "He cited many obstacles, such as the exemption of the cathedral chapters, the unbridled German nobility, the clergy's entrenched habit of these carnal vices, encouraged by Lutheran license, the tyranny of the secular princes, and the shortage of Catholic ministers," as the nuncio reported to Rome on 8 February, the day after his arrival in Speyer. 119

In a second letter written at the same time, Morone reported what other German bishops had told him. All were deeply skeptical about the possibility of renewing religious life, above all because the clergy were wholly unreliable: "This scarcity of priests frightens me throughout Germany, because they are few and not good, and I fear that in time we shall fall into paganism." 120 On the 9th he presented his credentials to King Ferdinand, 121 who immediately pointed out that convening a council in Italy "was not the way to silence the

Lutherans." 122 On the 15th Morone reported another long conversation in which the King of the Romans had painted a dramatic picture of the clergy's corruption and ignorance. Ferdinand insisted, however, that the pope himself must be the first "to carry out genuine reform, to remove the plurality of benefices from the cardinals, especially those of his own blood, and give them to those who have none; and to abolish the simony, pomp, and other vices of Rome, because from this arises the fact that His Holiness, by failing to correct himself, neither wishes nor is able to correct others." His words had been extremely severe, as the nuncio summarized them: 123

> Reform attempted through gentleness would have no effect, since the vices of the clergy had grown so greatly; putrid ulcers required corrosives, not soothing ointments. His Holiness, if he wished to fulfill his duty, must add force. If His Holiness failed to do so, the Catholic princes could not endure so many scandals and abuses. By these he did not mean what the Lutherans meant, but fornication, drunkenness, pomp, simony, plurality of benefices, ignorance, and similar vices among prelates and clergy. If His Holiness failed in this, not only ecclesiastical property but religion itself would be lost, because the people could no longer endure such enormity.

"Distress surrounds us on every side," Morone commented, convinced that only God could now "remedy so many contradictions" and that his journey served merely "to gain greater knowledge of the temper of this nation, which I would rather forget," as well as to introduce the new ordinary nuncio, Girolamo Verallo. Rome instructed Verallo always to act in close coordination with Morone, recognizing that the latter bore "the chief responsibility for the business." 124 Everywhere among the Catholic princes and bishops Morone encountered distrust and discouragement. In response to his urgent appeal to reform the German clergy by "removing manifest sins and scandals, which were intolerable in the sight of God and men and admitted of no delay," even Albert of Hohenzollern, cardinal and prince-elector of Mainz, replied that "nothing good would be accomplished through admonitions and exhortations, because he already knew that all his priests kept concubines and there was no need to investigate them; and he held it certain that, if anyone merely hinted that they must dismiss their concubines, they would either become Lutherans or demand wives," Morone wrote on 20 February. 125 On 3 March he reported to Rome that "our actions are interpreted in different ways, and almost always badly," that the Catholics were divided, and that "they so abhor this word 'reform' that we have become hateful to everyone; although some intend to reform themselves, they dislike appearing to do so because of the recess of Regensburg or at the urging of Our Lord." Increasingly disheartened and powerless, he could only express pessimism and frustration, observing that the "diminution" of the Apostolic See "not only pleases almost everyone, but is actively pursued by them." 126

Meanwhile Morone had written to all the German bishops and archbishops "about reform and the council," he reiterated on 7 March, while knowing perfectly well that "it will bear no fruit, for everyone is now so deeply entrenched in bad habits that not only are they unmoved from their vices by words, but rather mock the admonitions; and all take refuge in the saying, 'Physician, heal thyself,' arguing that we must first reform ourselves in Rome and Italy, after which we shall be better able to persuade them," thus relieving themselves of every responsibility. Although convinced of the need to convene the council, Charles V himself said "that the council will not be held, because if His Holiness truly wanted it, he would first reform himself, so as not to allow the council to reform him." 127 Once again, therefore, the conflict between papal and imperial loyalties made Morone's position difficult. This is also evident from his decision to keep Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga informed of developments at the

diet. Gonzaga experienced that conflict even more acutely because of his political responsibility for governing his small Po Valley principality and his furious hostility toward Paul III, which the pope warmly reciprocated. 128 No agreement seemed possible, Morone wrote on 4 March, since the Lutherans' demands were "so dishonorable that, if granted, within a short time they will bring about the total destruction of the ecclesiastical estate and of religion in Germany" - an outcome that seemed likely because of the diet's urgent need to vote financial aid for the war against the Turk. 129 A few days later he could only observe despondently that "everyone thinks of his private advantage, not the public good," and that whenever he raised the subject of Church reform he invariably received answers that made him "turn red." 130

"I can endure neither the air of Germany nor the labor," he complained to Farnese on 28 March. Still gravely afflicted by gout, he doubted whether he could even ride and asked to be allowed to return to Modena at the end of the diet, especially because the pope, "as a singular favor, deigned at the time of my departure to promise that he would not leave me long in Germany." 131 Publication of the recess was now imminent, and little remained for "the ministers of Our Lord in this province, and especially for me, who am utterly unable to tolerate such things, people, and prelates," he insisted on 3 April. As for the site of the council, he struggled to make Rome understand that the Germans would accept no location outside Germany and that Trent was the only possible solution. Rome had initially excluded it, proposing instead Mantua, Ferrara, Piacenza, and Bologna, but ultimately had to accept Trent against its will. 132 Alessandro Farnese wrote to him in these terms on 6 March, communicating the pope's decision and, as always, entrusting "the whole matter to Your Lordship's prudence." 133 In reality, despite Rome's last-minute attempt to put forward Cambrai, the agreement on a city within the Holy Roman Empire yet situated on the Italian side of the Alps, and therefore capable of reassuring the pope as well, was the greatest success of Morone's nunciature at Speyer. That success effectively brought the mission to an end. While papal delays and resistance in providing the promised aid for the war against the Turk generated fresh friction, Morone was able to set out for Modena on 13 April, "taking it as certain that His Holiness will deign not to burden me with traveling throughout Germany to proclaim the council," especially since his health would not permit it. 134 On 3 May he was in Mantua, from where he sent news of himself to Contarini, who invited him to spend a few days in Bologna. 135

Now recovering and eager "to devote myself to the complete restoration of my health" and to the needs of the diocese, 136 Morone reached Modena on the morning of 7 May 1542. He was welcomed with a solemn *Te Deum* in the cathedral, "and the whole city has taken great consolation from his return safe and sound, and may God grant him the grace to preserve this clergy of Modena well," Lancillotti recorded. 137 On 30 May, however, the chronicler had to note an unpleasant incident. During a solemn ceremony in the cathedral, the bishop accidentally dropped the precious reliquary containing the arm of Saint Geminianus, the city's patron. It fell to the ground in the midst of the people and was left "all twisted and dented." The event caused great alarm, above all in the bishop himself, "a devout and worthy man," and gave rise to many interpretations: "Some give it one meaning and some another." 138 Torrential rain reduced the Corpus Christi procession of 8 June to very little, 139 but Morone faced pastoral problems of an entirely different and far graver order, even as he never lost sight of the great international arena of papal policy, and Germany in particular.

From Speyer he had continued to send Contarini reports on Germany's dramatic situation, as the cardinal had requested on 1 April, 140 and he continued to do so after returning to Modena. 141 On 25 November 1543, for example, in Rome, he drafted a memorandum entitled *Reasons and Means by Which an Attempt Must Be Made to Prevent the Treatment of Religion at the Imperial Diet*, in preparation for the dispatch of nuncios or legates. As he had at Hagenau and Worms, he once again insisted "that it had never before been heard that, at a diet of mixed princes, ecclesiastical and secular, articles concerning matters of faith should be discussed, still less settled." The suspension of the Council of Trent, the renewal of hostilities with France, and the perpetual need to contain Ottoman pressure on the southeastern frontier reopened the alarming prospect of a German national council and a separate agreement between Charles V and the Protestants, with the risk that "some perverse dogma" might be approved. Clearly drafted in preparation for papal instructions for a new mission, the memorandum acutely grasped the often instrumental character of the Lutheran princes' positions, "for in truth Germany's division arises more from the private designs of certain men than from religion." It recommended pressing the emperor to make peace with France as the indispensable prerequisite for the council's assembly and for ending the wars that were devastating Christendom. 142

5. Modena's "Academy of Lutherans"

After agreement was reached at the Diet of Speyer on Trent as the council's location, its new convocation appeared imminent. Many believed that Morone's brilliant performance in Germany would induce the pope to entrust him with a major role in directing the synod, especially if the German bishops attended, and his elevation to the College of Cardinals was regarded as virtually certain. While awaiting events, he was able to remain in Modena for several months - something that had never happened since he took possession of the diocese in 1533 143 - and to confront the many problems about which Sigibaldi had kept him informed during the long years of his nunciatures. Among them was the long-standing question of the Union of Charitable Institutions: the effort to bring hospitals and confraternities under control, though they were divided by bitter internal conflicts, often badly or disastrously administered, and sometimes the objects of outright embezzlement and theft. For reasons that remain unclear, however, in September 1542 Morone intervened sharply in favor of the status quo, contradicting his earlier position, perhaps to avoid further tensions with the city's notables at a moment when the religious question was becoming explosive. 144

No less delicate was the choice of preachers to be sent to the city for the Advent and Lenten cycles, which required discerning the fine line that in those years separated devotional fervor from heretical proselytism. Morone had to confront this problem directly only after his return, since he had probably had little involvement in the appointments of the Lateran Canons Regular Arcangelo da Padova and Girolamo Negrone, who preached in Modena in 1531-32 (Negrone again in 1538), or of their fellow canon Serafino Aceti de' Porti, better known as Serafino da Fermo, who appeared repeatedly in Modena between 1537 and 1540. 145 A renowned preacher, Serafino had been crudely mocked by the Modenese Academicians in 1538, when his sermons against the *Summary of Holy Scripture* aroused their anger to the point that they smeared the pulpit from which he was to speak with excrement. 146

The issue then erupted violently in 1541, when the Augustinian chapter met in Modena itself. Sigibaldi had always viewed the order with suspicion and wrote to Morone on 4 April that its preachers were “stained with heresy and all follow Luther, so that the Apostolic See will be forced to extinguish them, as it once did the Templars.” Morone himself was also suspicious of them. 147 We have already seen how, on that occasion, in order to silence the Augustinian Egidio da Bergamo, whom the Conservators had appointed to preach the Lenten sermons in the cathedral, Morone had been obliged to request from Germany a papal brief authorizing the vicar to forbid anyone else from entering the pulpit and to impose a single preacher by authority. 148 The protests against this decree were sensational. It opened a conflict between temporal and spiritual power, delegitimized the city’s highest governing body, and even cast suspicion on its religious orthodoxy, culminating on 26 February in a “great tumult” when the vicar refused to revoke the order. 149 The situation was aggravated by the fact that the Carmelite Giovan Battista Granelli, whom the vicar had chosen, produced “very little, indeed no fruit” with his “very ill-judged chatter,” delivered before only a handful of listeners. Sigibaldi himself had to admit that if “the Augustinian or someone else preached, this man could certainly preach to the walls.” 150 Two days later Bernardino Ochino, passing through Modena, mounted the pulpit and succeeded in winning over everyone in that “curious city” 151 with the passionate eloquence that concealed the heterodox content of his sermons. It was a city “always delighted by sermons,” as Governor Battistino Strozzi wrote to the duke a week later. The Conservators renewed their campaign in defense of the Augustinian preacher, supported by the testimony of numerous citizens, “doctors of law and medicine,” ready to swear that he had “preached holy things and Catholic doctrine.” 152

The spread of heresy was to become Morone’s most arduous task. From afar he had tried to address it as best he could, pressing Rome for measures and seeking Marcello Cervini’s support for the vicar’s actions. He could hardly have failed to see, however, that Sigibaldi faced growing difficulties in dealing with doctrines and religious practices that became more explicit the more they were shared, or at least protected, by members of the urban patriciate and nobility. Morone devoted much of his energy to this task throughout the summer, becoming entangled in a web of discussions and negotiations. Despite his elevation to the cardinalate, he was effectively pushed aside by a forceful intervention of the Roman Inquisition, which began operating precisely in Modena after the promulgation of the bull *Licet ab initio* on 21 July 1542, formally establishing the institution and defining its duties. 153 For the moment, however, after years of absence, he was finally able to reside in his diocese for several months and fulfill an obligation he felt deeply. 154 His close relationship with Contarini, formed at Regensburg, may have intensified this sense of duty, since Contarini had always preached - though never practiced - the obligation of episcopal residence.

As noted above, the model Morone looked to for the reforms he hoped to enact was Giberti, 155 who had written to him in 1537 to emphasize their urgency. 156 Thus, from the periphery rather than the center of a curia still entrenched in the customs and abuses of the past, he strove to renew the clergy’s religious conscience as the indispensable basis of a different pastoral practice, inspired by the models of French evangelical reform. The chief guide of the Veronese bishop’s work had in fact been Ludovico da Canossa, bishop of Bayeux, where he had lived during the 1520s, and a man deeply connected to the dense network of relationships, religious sensibilities, doctrinal positions, and reform projects that coalesced in France during the third and fourth decades of the century around Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples and Marguerite of Navarre. 157 From this emerged the intense Veronese pastoral experiment

later known as the *gibertalis disciplina*, though it too was nourished by concealed heterodox currents. Its practical features would later inspire, in different ways, figures of the stature of Ercole Gonzaga in Mantua, Gabriele Paleotti in Bologna, and Carlo Borromeo in Milan. Morone also sought to adopt them, although he was continually interrupted by new political duties and always dependent on the Este duke's willingness to support his actions. 158

When the young nuncio returned to Modena, Contarini was in Bologna. Shortly after returning to Italy he had been appointed papal legate there on 27 January 1542 and had made his formal entry into the city at the end of March. On 8 May his secretary, Ludovico Beccadelli, wrote to his friend Carlo Gualteruzzi that Morone might pass through Bologna, and therefore "we shall have him here, unless you make him a cardinal." 159 Several phases can be distinguished in the Modenese events of those months. They must be carefully separated if their importance is to be understood, both for the history of religious dissent in those years and for the political and religious policies then taking shape at the summit of the Church. The bishop's role was naturally crucial, but the complex convergence of numerous religious and political pressures around those events requires a detailed reconstruction, fortunately made possible by abundant documentation.

A particularly valuable source is the long letter of 3 August 1542 in which Morone informed Alessandro Farnese of everything that had occurred up to that point and, immediately after the establishment of the Holy Office, left to the pope the decision whether he should continue the strategy he had chosen to bring back to the right path a city "defamed for heresy, not only in Rome but throughout Italy and beyond Italy." 160 He recalled the gravity of the situation he had found on his return, worse than he had imagined, because many were "entangled in it, great and small, men and women": clergy and laity, prominent citizens and ordinary people, physicians and men of letters, "persons of intelligence and enterprise." For that reason he had thought it best to proceed "with tact and gentleness," as he had always done in Germany, seeking to resolve the problem without lacerating conflicts or repressive measures, but by means of persuasion and dialogue.

Such an attitude was uncommon in Italy at the time. It was no accident that it was also adopted by bishops of varying heterodoxy, such as the brothers Pier Paolo and Giovan Battista Vergerio in Capodistria and Pola, Iacopo Nacchianti in Chioggia, and Vittore Soranzo in Bergamo. 161 Yet it was also a political and religious choice arising from Morone's German experience and made possible by the absence of any clear strategy at the summit of the Church. The Modenese affair itself would provide the decisive stimulus for that strategy to define itself in repressive terms, wholly different from and indeed opposed to Morone's attempt at conciliation. After his arrest in 1557, Morone himself would explain - naturally for purposes of self-defense - that the atmosphere in Italy at that earlier time had been very different from the storm winds that raged under the Carafa pontificate: 162

> Many years ago religious affairs in Italy were conducted with little order, because the office of the Holy Inquisition had not yet been established, or at least had not yet been firmly and powerfully founded. Thus ecclesiastical dogmas were discussed in every corner, everyone played the theologian, books were composed everywhere and sold without restraint in every place. Many places had no Inquisition, and in many others the inquisitors were men of little consequence, so that it was almost lawful, or at least tolerated, for everyone to do and say whatever he pleased.

Ten years later Cardinal Girolamo da Correggio, a member of the congregation, would write that “in various places in Italy there was talk of establishing the tribunal of the Inquisition, and in some it was established, but as a mere game.” 163 Until the mid-1540s heretical doctrines circulated everywhere: “nothing else was discussed, and everyone spoke of them freely and without fear”; “matters were not handled so strictly,” Endimio Calandra, then secretary to Ercole Gonzaga, would later confirm during his trial under Pius V. 164 Aware that he could rely little on secular authority, 165 partly because of the many connections between the Este court and the city’s leading families - a fact of which he complained to Rome 166 - Morone sought other ways to bring the lost sheep back into the Catholic fold. He first tried to identify the principal centers around which religious dissent had coalesced. He found confirmation of what his vicar had repeatedly written about certain “priests who make a profession of goodness of life and evangelical doctrine” - readily identifiable as Teggia and Bertari - and above all about the so-called Academy.

This was a group of young men of letters, physicians, and merchants, often members of the city’s most distinguished families, who met to discuss many subjects. In the increasingly heated climate of those years, religious questions soon came to predominate. They were approached with growing boldness and led to conclusions ever more divergent from Roman orthodoxy. The association originated around 1540, when “people began in Modena to discuss matters of religion and Lutheran things,” as Morone’s steward would later say, and it soon acquired “a bad reputation as bad Christians” and became known as “the Academy of Lutherans.” 167 This was not an isolated phenomenon. Many of the numerous academies founded at the time in various Italian cities - generally to support Pietro Bembo’s project of linguistic renewal and the legitimation of the vernacular as a vehicle suitable even for learned communication - were crossed by currents of heterodoxy: from the Florentine Academy to the Infiammati of Padua, from the Intronati of Siena to the Addormentati of Rovigo. 168

In Modena, however, more rapidly than elsewhere, critical and philological study of the texts of antiquity gave way to discussions of the Bible and its interpretation, until doctrines lacking a solid scriptural foundation were first questioned and finally denied. Moreover, as Sigibaldi repeatedly reported to the absent bishop, the Academy’s debates eventually overflowed the narrow confines of the intellectual elite and invaded the squares and workshops. They turned into open polemic not only against an ignorant and corrupt clergy and the superstitious practices of popular devotion, but also against purgatory and the veneration of saints, the sacraments, and papal authority. This helped make the Academy a point of reference for heterodox figures from other cities, especially nearby Bologna, such as Camillo Renato and Bartolomeo Fonzio.

Among the chief members of the Modenese circle were the great philologist Ludovico Castelvetro, who belonged to one of the city’s most distinguished families; Filippo Valentini, author of a treatise on the education of the prince 169 and cousin of Canon Bonifacio, repeatedly identified by Sigibaldi as one of the leading exponents of religious dissent; and the Cretan Francesco Porto, hired by the civic authorities to teach Greek “at the urging of certain Academicians - and the more they read, the more unbelieving they become in the faith of Christ,” Lancillotti commented. 170 There were also the humanist Alessandro Milani and physicians such as Gabriele Falloppia, Niccolò Machella, and Giovanni Grillenzoni. Grillenzoni was the Academy’s principal organizer and hosted its meetings in his house or

apothecary's shop, together with his brothers Antonio, Bartolomeo, and Francesco. The Modenese chronicler reports that every morning "more than fifty learned men" used to gather there, "and at times there were so many that it was impossible to pass through the street; when they rose to leave, they looked like a flock of starlings taking flight from that place." 171 Many were prominent figures in public life. Morone had probably known at least some of them during the years of his youth in Modena and was aware of their intellectual and social standing. 172 In any event, he soon realized that they, "being persons of intelligence and enterprise, were accustomed to proceed so cautiously that their secrets could be discovered only with difficulty." He therefore chose "the royal road" of pastoral guidance. He invited them to draw up a confession of faith, promising that it would remain secret "to spare them dishonor" and would serve only to satisfy him "in conscience" as to their orthodoxy, thus attempting to distinguish those learned men and religious figures from the "ignorant fools." Yet he immediately encountered stubborn resistance. They invoked "the danger to their honor," claimed they were unable "to formulate a confession," and feared that he might later, "at the instigation of false witnesses, proceed against them as relapsed heretics." 173

From the outset, therefore, the solution eventually adopted after long and exhausting negotiations began to take shape: the suspects would be asked to sign a simple formula of faith, preferably limited to the essential points of Catholic doctrine. To eliminate "the excuses mentioned above," the bishop proposed that they subscribe to an already published text, a vernacular catechism entitled *The Master's Questions to the Disciple*, which Giberti had had printed in Verona the previous year. Morone intended to circulate it in Modena as well, and it was in fact published there a few weeks later. 174 It is therefore clear that in the difficult pastoral undertaking before him, Morone looked first of all to the Veronese prelate. This is also suggested by his decision to test the religious opinions of his flock and reclaim the dissenters by using a catechism - an instrument of religious instruction and persuasion rather than repression. Moreover, as Alessandro Milani, one of the former suspects who had by then returned to the Church, would explain early in 1560, the bishop took care to present the initiative as an effort "to cleanse the city of Modena of the stain of heresy it appeared to bear." 175 He also relied on the authority conferred by his elevation to the College of Cardinals. Yet even this would not enable him to overcome the Academicians' resistance, as we shall now see.

Chapter Four

The Formula of Faith of 1542 and the Establishment of the Roman Holy Office

1. The Cardinalate

While awaiting a reply from the Academicians, and now fully aware of the complexity of the problems he faced, Morone decided to seek outside support in two directions. First he turned to Rome. On 22 May he wrote 1 requesting the authority both to punish heretics and to absolve repentant offenders extrajudicially, provided they publicly abjured and were not relapsed. A brief of 23 June granted these powers - though he never used them - and allowed

him to bypass any intervention by the Modenese Inquisition. 2 The day before, 21 May, Contarini's request for news from Germany and Modena had given him the opportunity to address a long and heartfelt letter to the cardinal. Morone described the situation he had found, the discussions in which he was engaged with the Academicians, and his determination to proceed "with charity." Above all, conscious of his lack of theological preparation and "aware of the dangers," he asked for Contarini's help and advice, hoping that the cardinal would agree to be "not only a participant but also the author, since I must continually thank His Divine Majesty that you are so near." 3

Morone's appeal arose chiefly from the bond formed between them at the Diet of Regensburg. Yet it must also be remembered that Filippo Valentini, one of the leaders of Modenese heterodoxy, had moved into the household of the Bologna legate. Valentini had previously been a member of Contarini's household, and the cardinal had appointed him "his auditor in civil matters," 4 hoping, among other things, "to accomplish through him no small benefit for the affairs of Modena," as he had written to Tommaso Badia on 1 April. 5 On 22 May, the very speed of his reply revealing his keen desire to help find a solution to those problems, the Venetian cardinal promised his cooperation "because of the brotherly love I bear him." 6

Until the end of May, however, while awaiting the brief requested from Rome and before Contarini's intervention became necessary, the affair remained confined to Modena. Even at this stage, the dissenters demonstrated their ability to devise a skillful defensive strategy, to argue and bargain - "they are crafty," Sigibaldi had written on 1 March 1541 7 - and above all their awareness of the remaining areas of doctrinal uncertainty and of the differing tendencies at the summit of the ecclesiastical institution, where it appeared possible to find interlocutors receptive to their demands. For a brief period, such an opening seemed to be offered by the group known as the *spirituali*, gathered in 1541 around the English cardinal Reginald Pole and the Valdesian teaching of Marcantonio Flaminio, to whom the next chapter will return at length. Although they very quickly attracted inquisitorial suspicion, their existence reveals the fluidity of a religious situation still open to different outcomes, and therefore capable of sustaining expectations and hopes that would last throughout the 1540s and beyond.

Hence the bitter polemics of religious exiles such as Francesco Negri and Pier Paolo Vergerio against the dangerous example those authoritative prelates offered "to so many worthy men of Italy, who depended upon them" 8 and who therefore continued to contaminate themselves "with unlawful forms of worship, saying that this is permitted because Cardinal Pole says so, and they follow him supinely as though he were an apostle." 9 The Modenese heterodox were also caught up in these expectations and hopes, as suggested by Valentini's move to Bologna to join Contarini and by the proposals advanced during the negotiations with Morone.

The Academicians rejected the simple catechism Morone was preparing to print. They raised "frivolous" objections concerning "the propriety of the vernacular language" and claimed that the booklet was "too childish, since matters of faith must be treated with greater seriousness." In an attempt to force them into the open, Morone therefore asked them to suggest a book "more suited to the purpose" that they would be willing to sign. 10 He then found himself in an embarrassing situation when they presented him with a manuscript work by Cardinal Federico Fregoso, who had died in November 1541 - probably his lost

Treatise on the Christian Life. 11 It was “learnedly and ingeniously written in the vernacular,” but Morone had to reject it hastily because “in some respects it was inadequate for our need and in others not entirely safe.” Thus the bishop himself was forced to admit, first before the Academicians and then in a letter to Farnese, that a book by an illustrious cardinal was “not entirely safe.” He tried to extricate himself by pleading that, “being full of philosophy, it was not suited to the unlearned.”

For precisely the opposite reasons - “because this too was briefer than the city’s defamation required, omitting many articles” - Morone was then obliged to reject the still more troubling proposal made immediately afterward by his highly skillful interlocutors. They presented another anonymous and unpublished vernacular text, “which they said had been written by Marcantonio Flaminio and the Viterbo company.” 12

The proposal was all the more disconcerting because the booklet was none other than Juan de Valdés’s catechism *The Manner to Be Followed in Instructing the Children of Christians in Matters of Religion*. Morone himself later said it had been given to him “in Modena by those of the Academy when I had printed an instruction for children taken from Bishop Gian Matteo of Verona.” It is therefore unsurprising that he also rejected this brief summary of Christian doctrine, rich in heterodox implications, whose anonymity he was unable to penetrate: “Gentlemen, I could never discover who had written it, because they used the trick of having it delivered to me by a man dressed as a friar whom I did not know.” 13

Apart from this last detail, which once again reveals the ambiguities and stratagems that characterized the affair, the identification proposed here raises more problems than it solves. It is difficult to believe that the Academicians, while knowing the suspect booklet to be Valdés’s work, would consciously have lied - at the risk of an immediate and dangerous refutation - by attributing it to the “company” that Beccadelli was calling in those very days the “Viterbo Church.” 14 It seems more likely that, in presenting it under Flaminio’s name, they were simply indicating its provenance and declaring from whom they had received it. Yet this hypothesis implicates the group gathered around Cardinal Pole, revealing its contacts and complicity with the Modenese heterodox - connections that other sources also allow us to glimpse, extending as far as support for their resistance to their own bishop.

Meanwhile, on 2 June 1542, and also in view of the imminent convocation of the council, Paul III announced in consistory the elevation of Morone, then only thirty-three years old, to the cardinalate. In doing so he acknowledged Morone’s great merits in the German nunciatures, his political intelligence, his moral integrity, and the pastoral zeal he was demonstrating in his diocese. In Bologna, where the bishop of Modena had gone to discuss the Modenese affair, Contarini placed on his head the red biretta brought by Antonio Elio. 15 In the days that followed Morone received dozens of letters from relatives, friends, acquaintances, collaborators, bishops, cardinals, and princes, including Ferdinand of Habsburg, who “greatly rejoiced” at his promotion “as that of a person better known and dearer to His Majesty than the others.” 16

Sigibaldi informed him of the city’s great celebration. The civic authorities and cathedral canons ordered “fires of rejoicing” 17 for the elevation of three Modenese prelates to the Sacred College, accompanied “by the ringing of bells, the lighting of fires, and the display of their coats of arms.” 18 Alongside Morone, the purple was bestowed on two other figures close to Contarini: the Benedictine abbot Gregorio Cortese, his “right eye” according to

Aleandro, 19 and the Dominican Tommaso Badia, Master of the Sacred Palace, who had accompanied him to Regensburg. Both were Modenese, both members of religious orders and learned theologians, and both about a quarter-century older than Morone. “Chosen for their learning and virtues to be employed at the council to be held this year,” Lancillotti proudly noted, 20 they would soon become involved in the struggle with the Academicians. 21

On that very day, just returned from the consistory, “weary in body and greatly consoled in spirit by this working of God’s Spirit in the mind of His Holiness,” Reginald Pole wished to be the first to inform Contarini. He said that Morone’s appointment had seemed certain, Cortese’s predictable, and Badia’s entirely unexpected. In a postscript he reported Alessandro Farnese’s remark that, had Contarini himself been asked to choose two cardinals, he would have selected Cortese and Badia, so that he could regard himself as “the first and principal instrument of this holy election.” 22 Alvise Priuli, the English cardinal’s trusted secretary, likewise considered the elevation of those men - Badia in particular - “miraculous in every way, all things considered,” as he wrote in a letter sent to Beccadelli at the same time. 23

The joy and astonishment with which Contarini and Pole received the news can be explained by the turning point those appointments appeared to represent after the effective isolation into which the group centered on the Venetian cardinal had fallen following the controversies and accusations that greeted his return from Regensburg. His dispatch to Bologna as head of “the most honorable legation the Church possesses within its State,” as Beccadelli would make a point of emphasizing in his biography, 24 certainly signaled the Farnese family’s undiminished esteem. To some, however, it may also have appeared to exclude Contarini from every political role in the curia, where the failure of the religious colloquies had cleared the road toward the council. Prestigious though it was, the appointment confined him far from Rome and burdened him with onerous administrative and judicial duties, among “lawsuits and prisons and similar entanglements,” as Beccadelli complained, thereby making his defeat plain.

Now the admission to the Sacred College of figures such as Badia, Cortese, and Morone offered hope that the wind had changed. This hope grew still stronger two months later, on 7 August, when the Venetian cardinal seemed to reenter the sphere of high papal policy through his appointment as peace legate to Charles V. What is clear, in any case, is the political skill with which Paul III used these elevations to soften Contarini’s defeat while maintaining a position of equilibrium with the intransigents led by Carafa, to whom he was preparing to concede the establishment of the Holy Office. 25

From the very beginning, therefore, the problems Morone had to confront stood out clearly: the pervasive spread of heresy even among the city’s leading men; their skill in evading every attempt to ascertain their doctrinal positions; and the sophisticated theological culture that enabled them to meet illustrious cardinals on equal terms. Morone made every effort to avoid an authoritarian condemnation of this religious dissent and instead to reabsorb it within the ecclesiastical institution. He sought instruments through which to translate into practice the openness to dialogue he had developed over the long years of his German nunciatures and that had been strengthened by his encounter with Contarini. 26 Yet the hope that adherence to a simple formula of faith might provide an effective means of calming heretical agitation would soon prove illusory.

Morone would find himself trapped within an ever-narrower room for maneuver, pressed on two fronts. On the one hand, he was unable to offer the Academicians answers adequate to the maturity of their dissent; on the other, he was cornered by the rise of radically different policies at the summit of the Church. Contarini's attempt to regain room for political initiative and, taking the Modenese affair as his starting point, to reassert his leadership of the reforming party, as we shall now see, would serve only to reveal the divisions that already undermined its cohesion. In turn, the inability to find a compromise formula with the Modenese heterodox would once again expose the fundamental impossibility of translating into pastoral practice the premises, orientations, and perspectives that underlay both Italian evangelical reform and its Valdesian development, to which the next chapter is devoted.

Hence the failure that awaited Morone and Contarini. Yet the Academicians' position was no less difficult. During that tense confrontation they would become aware that their doctrinal choices constituted an alternative to Catholic orthodoxy. At the same time, they helped eliminate the already limited spaces in which dissent might still be practiced and thus, paradoxically, contributed to the political success of the intransigents with whom they would later have to reckon. The overall meaning of the controversy over the formula of faith of 1542 is contained in these contradictions: in tensions tightening to the breaking point around it and gradually expanding beyond the specific Modenese setting. It should also be remembered that the failure of the irenic strategy promoted by the bishop, supported by two other illustrious cardinals, Contarini and Cortese, marked the disappearance of the only alternative to the Roman Holy Office's repressive rigor. That office was established at precisely this moment, with explicit reference to "the affairs of Modena," in order to put an end to the ambiguous religious dialogue Morone had attempted. Far from remaining confined within the city walls, what took place in Modena during the spring and summer of 1542 had decisive significance for the religious history of those years. For this reason too, it is worth reconstructing the episode in detail, in order to account for the many problems that became intertwined within it.

2. Contarini's Catechism and the Discussion with Pole

The Modenese had rejected Giberti's catechism, and Morone had rejected both Fregoso's work and the Valdesian text presented to him under Flaminio's name. Another solution therefore had to be found. The bishop decided to turn to Contarini and ask him to draft an ad hoc text that the Academicians could not avoid signing: the so-called *Articuli orthodoxae professionis*, published posthumously in 1553 under the title *Catechesis sive christiana instructio*. Morone left his diocese on 2 June, the very day Paul III appointed him cardinal, 27 and remained in Bologna until the 6th. He then returned to Modena, where he was welcomed "with great festivity and triumph" 28 and granted honorary citizenship on the 12th. 29 During their meeting Contarini agreed to Morone's request, which was intended "to provide some remedy for the things said to exist in Modena" - that is, to refute the Academicians' "errors," while "adding some other matter so as to make a complete body." 30 This partly explains the character of the work, composed in great haste amid "endless occupations" and delivered to Modena eight days later. 31 In the case of certain articles, such as the final one on Latin prayers not understood by the great mass of the uneducated, 32 it is easy to see who was being addressed: in this instance, Don Giovanni Bertari, who had questioned the value of such prayers in his lectures on Saint Paul.

Concise and effective, the text dealt chiefly with the sacraments - especially the Eucharist and confession - as well as the Mass, purgatory, the invocation of saints, and prayer. The recent and still unresolved controversy provoked by Contarini's position at Regensburg probably led him to devote no specific article to justification. 33 Yet his views permeate the entire text. It opens by implicitly restating the familiar formula of *duplex iustitia*, founded on faith in the saving value of Christ's Passion, "through which our sins are forgiven and the Holy Spirit is given to us," and on the charity by which that faith "is nourished and grows." 34 Penance derives its sacramental value "from faith in the Passion of Christ," and "the remission of sins and reconciliation with God take place only through Christ and his merits, to whom we are united through faith," Contarini wrote. 35 He emphasized that observance of ecclesiastical liturgies, though necessary, did not guarantee the forgiveness of sins, "which is given to us through Christ alone." 36 Only the ignorant could claim - and only the seditious could attribute to the Church the opinion - that monastic rules and the severe discipline imposed by religious vows were a means of attaining eternal life, which is obtained instead "through Christ." 37

On these premises, the text sought to demonstrate the consistency of this doctrine of justification with Catholic teaching on purgatory, the saints, and their invocation, and to prevent readers from "presumptuously abandoning its meaning" through unwarranted "conclusions." 38 For this reason the Venetian cardinal repeatedly declared that he wished to avoid subtle and useless theological disputation and instead leave some room for mediation with the recipients of the text. He never explicitly dwelt on the meritorious value of works. He maintained, for example, that the seven sacraments were not all sacraments "for precisely the same reason"; 39 that prayers not understood still possessed value "by virtue of inward feeling and intention," although they lacked "the fruit they would yield if understood"; 40 that the Eucharist is received "as spiritual nourishment for the soul when it is received with faith made perfect by charity"; 41 and that the sacrificial value of the Mass consists in a "sacrifice of praise," a "sacrifice of thanksgiving," and the "memorial of that unique sacrifice in which Christ offered himself for us," adding only at the end that it is also "the sacrifice in which we offer Christ and his Passion." 42

There is no need to penetrate further into the subtleties of the text. It contained no mention, among other things, of predestination, on which Morone - and later Cortese - had urged Contarini to express himself. Its simple language, catechetical structure, absence of polemical tones, and attempt to answer the Academicians' demands with carefully shaded theological formulas ended by concealing its controversial origins. In this sense the work must be seen not only as the instrument through which Contarini sought to collaborate with Morone, but also as one of the last expressions of his theological thought and of the complex religious proposal connected with it.

Among the first to read the formula of faith was Gregorio Cortese, who had likewise just received the red hat. Morone sent it to him immediately after receiving it from Bologna in mid-June, especially because in December 1541 the pope had charged the learned Benedictine with investigating and reporting on the heresies proliferating in the Emilian city, to which Cortese was now preparing to return. 43 Asked for his judgment, Cortese replied on 22 June with words of praise: "Everything contained in these articles appears to me Catholic, true, and pious," he said, "and written with great seriousness and learning; none of the matters presently in controversy has been left undiscussed." He would nevertheless have preferred to

discuss them in person “for fuller expression and clarity.” For the moment he merely attached a sheet suggesting three changes, none of which was incorporated into the final version. All were intended to state more explicitly the orthodox definition of crucial issues: the meritorious value of works, the real presence of Christ’s body in the Eucharist, and the problem of grace and free will. 44

Cortese’s letter also shows that Morone had informed him of Contarini’s intention to have the text approved and signed by other authoritative figures, “great lords of learning and authority.” The Benedictine considered this useful because the Academicians would then no longer be able “to offer any excuse, nor claim any dishonor on the grounds that by signing they had been suspected and marked.” In his view it would also create a precedent should similar problems arise in the future and elsewhere. 45 Yet he looked at the matter entirely from a Modenese perspective, convinced that those invited to sign the *Articuli* could “persuade themselves that they were being sought not as suspects but as witnesses to the truth.” Here the role he would play during the summer began to emerge. He offered Morone valuable assistance both because his less conspicuous position, lacking a precise institutional profile, gave him greater freedom of action and, above all, because ties of kinship and friendship connected him with the city’s most illustrious families and with some of the Academicians, among whom he could therefore undertake a work of mediation.

In attributing Contarini’s proposal solely to the desire to increase the authority of the formula of faith and prevent its signatories from appearing suspected of heresy, however, Cortese missed the essential motive behind it, which extended beyond the Modenese setting. It is unlikely that the legate of Bologna feared that his own prestige and Morone’s would be insufficient to overcome the resistance of a Girolamo Teggia or a Bonifacio Valentini. In reality, Contarini wished to broaden the debate because, using this text as a basis, he hoped to force a general clarification within the party that had once accepted his leadership but had since appeared divided over the formulas he proposed at Regensburg. On that occasion the papal legate had been able to count in Rome on the support of Bembo and Fregoso. Pole’s conduct had been different: he preferred to withdraw from the struggle in consistory, leaving Contarini exposed to his opponents’ attacks and indirectly contributing to the collapse of his political strategy. 46

This could not fail to surprise and embitter Contarini. After returning to Italy, isolated and forced to confront the slanders that greeted him, he began to suspect that Pole’s unexpected withdrawal from the Roman stage had resulted from a distancing from his doctrinal positions. He was not mistaken. As the next chapter will show, the English cardinal was then undergoing the religious experience that would lead him to embrace the teachings of the Spanish exile Juan de Valdés and to distance himself from Contarini, whom he had previously regarded as a teacher. From this perspective, the Modenese affair appeared to the Venetian cardinal as an opportunity to sound out Pole’s opinions and explore the possibility of a religious regrouping capable of relaunching his political initiative, now stalled both on the front of curial reform and in dialogue with the Protestant world.

Contarini had already attempted to reopen discussion with Pole by sending him writings and observations that Flaminio would take into account when composing his “reply to that Father Polito,” 47 namely the little treatise *On the Benefit of Christ*, on which he was then working. The fact remains that a few weeks later, on the eve of his death, when Contarini finally received the manuscript of that small book, he reacted with dismay and concern on

seeing that it “went beyond the limits,” repeatedly exclaiming: “Oh, poor Flaminio, he goes too far!” 48 This may have been the work that, on 15 August, Priuli suggested Beccadelli should “skillfully give him to read one day after dinner or after his midday sleep, asking him to be so good as to note whether it contained anything that seemed contrary to true and sound Catholic doctrine; then take the trouble to inform me of it in detail and send the same writing back to me.” He was plainly aware of the reactions it might provoke. 49 We shall return to the *Benefit of Christ*, in whose circulation Morone himself would become personally involved a few months later. 50

In any case, in June 1542, after what had occurred the previous year and after Contarini’s overtures, it fell to Pole to take some step toward the clarification needed if a common project was to be resumed. Such a project seemed all the more necessary as Rome prepared for the political turn embodied in the establishment of the Holy Office. It is not known whether Contarini’s idea of involving the English cardinal was also prompted by what Morone had personally told him in Bologna about the heterodox text the Academicians had presented as the work of Flaminio and the “Viterbo company.” By acting in this way, however, despite the consideration and caution imposed by their cardinalitial dignity, Contarini more or less consciously pursued toward Pole a course not very different from the one he was following with the Modenese dissenters. The misunderstandings, or illusions, that characterized one side of the discussion would inevitably recur on the other.

The letter in which Contarini addressed the English cardinal is not known today. Only Pole’s reply survives, dated at Viterbo on 20 June and written in the name “of this whole company of ours here, and especially of the most illustrious lady Marchioness [Vittoria Colonna].” 51 It lavished praise on the “gift of grace” shining forth in Contarini’s commitment to the “business of Modena,” but was evasive in substance. 52 As always, Pole promised to give his judgment “concerning the manner of carrying out this holy purpose” as soon as he received the text, which Contarini had also sent to Badia. Yet he preferred to leave the real substance of the question, beyond conventional formulas, to the parallel letter from Priuli to Beccadelli - to the correspondence between the secretaries.

There, in a very different tone, Pole hastened to warn Contarini of the alarming situation that had arisen in Rome, where he had remained until only a few days earlier. 53 In conversations with Cardinals Gian Pietro Carafa, Juan Álvarez de Toledo, and Marcello Cervini - the future high command of the Roman Holy Office - he had perceived that severe measures against heresy were imminent. This was almost a warning, given that those conversations had focused especially on “the affairs of Naples,” one year after the death of Valdés, several of whose disciples had found hospitality with the English cardinal. 54

For this reason, quite apart from any question concerning the formula of faith, the delicate mediation undertaken by Contarini and Morone risked becoming useless and even dangerous, especially “considering the uproar caused by the affairs of Regensburg,” Priuli explained. All this suggested following a “safer and quieter path”: submitting the matter to the pope’s decision, sending Contarini’s *Articuli* to Rome, and asking authorization to proceed. The adherence of “the other most reverend cardinals named” might then be collected later “through private letters.” Sadoleto’s support would in any case be difficult to obtain. He was “more scrupulous in such matters,” seemed to have distanced himself from Contarini, and had “made his position clearly understood concerning the article on justification.” Only Bembo’s intervention, prompted by Pole, had persuaded him “at least to suspend writing on

this and every other article" until he had discussed the matter with the entire group: Contarini, Cortese, Badia, and Pole himself.

The moment was grave, Pole informed Bologna, attributing to Bembo a sentence on which he clearly wished Contarini to reflect carefully: one must consider "how important and how scandalous it might be if it became known that, on matters of such importance, men of this stature differed in opinion." 55 The English cardinal had not yet been able to read Contarini's work, but his invitation to caution was explicit. He urged him to withdraw from what threatened to become a trap and made clear that this difficult moment was ill suited to initiating a doctrinal clarification within a group whose unity should not be overestimated.

It was precisely from this clear-sighted analysis - fully confirmed by subsequent developments - that Pole also drew the pretext for refusing to sign the formula of faith and postponing the clarification requested by Contarini. The Venetian cardinal's work nevertheless reached Viterbo in early July. 56 On the 18th Pole wrote from there to Bologna, apologizing for the delay in replying to the letter containing the *Articuli orthodoxae professionis*. The delay, he said, arose only from the need for a trusted courier, "more certain and secure" than the ordinary post. The reason for this caution is evident from the laconic conclusion of the note: "I am certain Your Most Reverend Lordship has already heard of the appointment of the six most reverend cardinals, especially concerning the affairs of Lucca and Modena. I therefore need add nothing more, having nothing else to say for the present." 57

The times, in short, were becoming dangerous. Even cardinals had to be careful about what they said and wrote, especially since someone claimed the right to search through their correspondence. Together with this note, the English cardinal sent his opinion of Contarini's formula. On the 22nd the Venetian cardinal acknowledged receiving his comments. 58 Pole's memorandum has been lost, but Contarini's reply shows that his reservations centered chiefly on the article concerning penance. This explains why, a few days later, Contarini sent to Viterbo the little treatise *De poenitentia*, in which he would make one last attempt to clarify his thought on grace and justification and renew the dialogue with Pole. 59

This time the English cardinal did not avoid the discussion. It may by then have been impossible for him doctrinally, but it was politically unavoidable once Contarini's appointment to the Spanish legation, and Sadoleto's to the French legation, reopened prospects that had seemed extinguished after Regensburg. 60 On 8 August Pole merely acknowledged receipt of Contarini's text and promised to send a "full reply" as soon as possible. 61 In a subsequent letter of the 14th he again expressed his desire to explain his opinion "on this matter, which certainly deserves no small consideration, although I had hoped to satisfy myself better in person than by letters." 62 A few days later the Bologna legate's sudden illness and death would definitively end this difficult discussion at a distance. Before he died, however, the Venetian cardinal probably had time to read Pole's response to his *De poenitentia*. Its contents can only be inferred from the concern with which Priuli hastened to ask Beccadelli to keep the document confidential in his possession, together with other writings sent from Viterbo. 63 As far as can be judged, the debate had already become unproductive, a confrontation between irreconcilable theological positions. It marked Contarini's final failure at the very moment when Ochino's flight - after he had come to meet the cardinal in Bologna on the eve of his death - underscored the full gravity and implications of the political turn that had matured in Rome. 64 Unable to offer the Modenese Academicians

the space for an acceptable compromise, Contarini's formula of faith could not even provide common ground between doctrinal positions that until recently had been shared but had now diverged under the influence of Valdesian teaching.

3. "These Wise and Learned Moderns of Ours"

At the same time, for opposite reasons, Sadoleto too was tending to withdraw, as Pole had taken care to inform Bologna. He adopted a personal approach to the Modenese affair, doubtless prompted by his membership in one of the city's most authoritative families, but wholly independent of the effort in which Morone was then engaged. As early as 12 June, probably the day after the consistory in which the requests Morone had sent to Rome on 22 May and the grave reports supplied by "certain cardinals" were discussed, Sadoleto had asked the pope "not to act further upon these suspicions until I had reminded him of my opinion." He then wrote to "Messer Ludovico Castelvetro and his companions" to warn them of the "adverse report" that had been made about them.

"For the sake of our native city, of letters, of friendship, and of my belief that you are all honorable men," Sadoleto declared himself ready to defend them, provided no one made himself "suspect of new opinions not held by our most holy forefathers." He exhorted them "to desist from every novelty" and to break off all relations with anyone determined "to persist in some fancy of his own." 65 This intervention already lagged behind the reality of the Modenese situation. It had not been requested by Morone or Contarini and in fact risked wrong-footing them by offering the Academicians a new interlocutor, although one unwilling to undertake a patient doctrinal discussion and ready to rely above all on the bonds of solidarity within the urban patriciate.

The replies from Castelvetro, Alessandro Milani, Giovanni Grillenzoni, and Francesco Porto, dated between 2 and 7 July, 66 were very similar in their tone of humble respect and gratitude for the promised "paternal service" and "protection." They were equally alike in the evident ambiguity of the statements with which they claimed orthodoxy, often moving along the fine line separating cautious reticence from conscious Nicodemism. "I hold no opinion unworthy of a true Christian, nor have I ever made, do I now make, or will I ever make myself suspect of new opinions not held by our most holy forefathers," Castelvetro wrote, attributing the suspicions solely to envious slander. Milani's letter was similar. He claimed to devote himself only to studies "concerned more with the world than with Holy Scripture" and to his own peace of mind, which "could suffer no greater disturbance than that brought by novelty of opinions." He emphasized his complete fidelity "in outward matters" to "the customs of the Holy Roman Church." 67

Grillenzoni's reply was longer and more detailed. He too attributed to "malicious men" and "the rage of certain persons" - especially "the friars of Saint Dominic, who would not wish any learning other than their own to exist in the cities" - responsibility for the slanders directed against Porto's lectures. Morone himself, he said, had been Porto's "pupil" and spoke of him "with honor." The same slanders were aimed at the circle of intellectuals who studied "Greek and Latin letters," "without ever looking at the smallest word of Holy Scripture, except for a few who, having more leisure, devoted themselves to it separately and examined it diligently, but who for that reason have never said anything that could not be said, still less believed it."

As for himself, Grillenzoni claimed never to have studied “either the Old or New Testament, nor any authors of Holy Scripture,” except in his youth. The accusations against him could arise only from the severity with which he condemned “wrongdoers, among whom” - he wrote in a plainly anti-friar polemic - “I especially dislike the idle, the ignorant, and the hypocrites”: those who criticized preachers of the pure Gospel, including “the great Fra Bernardino [Ochino],” on the ground that “he spoke too much of Christ.” Grillenzoni also attacked Sigibaldi, who had “never ceased writing evil reports” to the bishop and to Rome. He hoped that the measures “to remove this accursed suspicion, about which so much has been said outside Modena and without cause, may be taken without tumult; for if there are ten or twelve common people who say something foolish, what fault is that of the honorable men?”

In conclusion he assured Sadoleto “that no one in our company is suspect of new opinions unworthy of a true Christian, or fails to approve, in addition to the Old and New Testaments, what the holy ancient and modern commentators have left us in writing, as well as all the creeds; and that in all things each one always submits himself to the Holy Roman Church and the holy councils.” Porto, finally, declared that he had always believed “what the Catholic Church has held and holds.” Yet he first made an explicit profession of Nicodemism: “As for my opinions, God, the perfect knower of human hearts, knows whether they are new or perverse; and even if they were, because of my profound silence and my natural inclination, which is hostile to troubling or offending any living person, they could harm no one.” 68

These letters were undoubtedly coordinated in advance. They reveal the narrowing room for maneuver still available to the Modenese heterodox, now forced to resort to reticent declarations, mental reservations, and outright lies in affirming their fidelity to the Church. Their effort to separate the Academy from the “common people,” to offer the guarantee of their socially prudent caution, to appeal to a sort of cultural complicity, and to blame ignorant friars for the suspicions directed against them was weak. It was dangerous ground that could be occupied only as long as they were able to exploit the delays of the ecclesiastical institution and the contradictions at its summit. It was bound to erode rapidly as theological dividing lines became more precise and practical instruments for controlling and repressing religious dissent were defined.

The Modenese affair allows this process to be observed not only in the failure of the dialogue initiated by Morone and Contarini, but also in the Academicians’ retreat toward a Nicodemite choice that expressed their awareness of their distance from Catholic orthodoxy, with all the risks this entailed. The long negotiations in which they engaged, the devices they employed to postpone the reckoning demanded of them, and their withdrawal to ever more restricted defensive lines marked the stages of this process. The letters sent to Sadoleto in early July document its initial phase.

As for Sadoleto’s initiative, on 15 July he replied to the apparently reassuring professions of orthodoxy he had received, expressing his “consolation” at the confirmation they provided of the writers’ “Christian and Catholic spirit.” The previous day he had reported on them in consistory and discussed them in a “private and lengthy conversation” with the pope. He suggested that his fellow citizens should address a collective letter to the pontiff similar to those they had sent him, and indicated its content more or less explicitly. 69 It is unsurprising that this letter was never sent, since Sadoleto’s request was in substance identical to the one Morone had made from the beginning. His personal initiative therefore ultimately converged with that of the Milanese cardinal. At the end of August, although in a context profoundly

changed by the establishment of the Holy Office, Sadoleto would work alongside Morone to compel the Academicians to sign the text that had been presented to them in mid-June. We must therefore return to Modena to follow the development of the affair after the dispatch of Contarini's formula.

Having received the *Articuli* and the favorable judgment of Cortese and other unspecified "learned and Catholic persons," Morone presented the document to the suspected Modenese. He was immediately drawn, "with the greatest labor," into new negotiations and discussions. It was precisely at this stage, in the course of close debate with Teggia and Bertari - both priests and therefore more entitled than the others to discuss doctrinal questions - that he became convinced that "their real opinions are different from these, as far as I have been able to understand from various conversations held with some of them," as he wrote to Farnese on 3 August. 70

The letter in which Morone, around 20 June, transmitted to Contarini the observations he and Bertari had made after examining the articles has been lost. Contarini replied on the 23rd, expressing benevolence toward "Don Giovanni and all the other learned men" and rejoicing that there was "no difference or disagreement in Catholic meaning." He was willing to make some corrections to remedy copying errors in the text and to accept the request for more exact references to biblical passages. Yet the Venetian cardinal insisted on a citation from Saint Augustine that the Modenese priest had considered illegitimate, on the formulation of the doctrine of the real presence under both species of the sacrament, on the necessity of confession to a priest, and on the observance of ecclesiastical ceremonies. He refused an ambiguous addition proposed by Bertari. 71 Firm in substance but calm in tone, and inviting cooperation toward "the peace and unity of the Church," the letter reflects Contarini's more detached vantage point in comparison with Morone's. In those very days, however, Morone felt the need to confer with him in Bologna. 72

After returning to Modena, increasingly discouraged, on 3 July the Milanese cardinal informed his Venetian colleague that discussions of the formula of faith with Teggia and Bertari had resumed. Despite "many cautions" and professions of "humility," they were ready to raise new objections, complaining "that the consciences of some men would be burdened beyond what was contained in Holy Scripture." Only with difficulty, after making "many promises" and assuring them "that no harm would come from speaking freely in contradiction," did Morone persuade them to examine the articles again and state their opinion.

Teggia declared bluntly that he intended "to accept those that appear to him necessary for salvation, while in all other respects submitting himself to the future council." He argued that many matters in the articles were things "of which, being a grammarian by profession, he possessed no knowledge - for example, whether the sacraments are seven, more, or fewer, since they are not expressly stated in Holy Scripture." The situation therefore remained difficult, Morone concluded. He was forced to make every effort to free himself from this web of instrumental objections, explicit resistance, and impenetrable ambiguity: "They torment themselves and fear coming to this test, and from many indications it can be understood that they do not like the articles." For his part, he would continue to manage the affair "with every possible patience and tact," also relying on Cortese's help; Cortese was to reach Modena on 4 July. 73

Yet as proof that Morone understood that very different strategies were maturing in Rome, and that he himself risked becoming the accused, he begged Contarini to ensure that his "letters do not fall into the hands of anyone except your faithful secretaries, because that could damage this cause." 74

With Cortese's arrival the negotiations became still more intense, although the private character of the pressure he exerted on the Academicians makes them difficult to follow. The correspondence between Morone and Contarini during these weeks nevertheless shows that the dissenters' attempt to modify the articles on some substantial point - though the articles had been drafted precisely to test the suspicions against them - rested on illusory premises and was doomed to fail. In his brief reply of 6 July, Contarini urged Morone to persist on the path he had chosen and to continue "in the humane manner he has begun." With regard to Bertari's observations - for which he still thanked him as a "good friend" - he refused to enter the treacherous linguistic terrain onto which the Modenese priest had tried to draw him. "I care little about being criticized, especially for my Latin and Ciceronian style, which I forgot many years ago and no longer think about," he wrote, stressing that the problem was one of substance, not form: "You know my meaning, and that it is Catholic; arrange the words as you please." 75

A week later, replying to a lost letter from Morone in which he learned that the Academicians were advancing further objections concerning a "passage on the Church" and the meritorious value of works, even the Venetian cardinal lost patience with "these wise and learned moderns of ours." They were dominated, he wrote, by "such arrogance and pride, the mother of every evil, joined with great ignorance, that I think every evil of them, and I do not believe they can be recovered by means of humanity and kindness." "The disease has certainly penetrated very deeply." 76

The failure of the devices repeatedly used to legitimize or conceal their dissent threatened dangerous repercussions among the Modenese heterodox. "During this process," Morone wrote to Farnese on 3 August, "many incidents have occurred, among them that on several occasions these learned men have considered fleeing." 77 Yet although forced to accept Contarini's formula of faith without alteration, 78 the Academicians still sought a final ground for negotiation, possible cover, and ambiguous compromise in the wording with which they would sign it.

"Finally, after lengthy negotiations," through Cortese and "another person" - perhaps the Modenese Dominican Pietro Bertano, 79 the future cardinal of Fano who would himself later attract inquisitorial suspicion - they informed the bishop that they were willing to sign the articles and proposed two formulas. Morone subsequently transmitted them to Rome, writing them in his own hand on the copy of Contarini's text sent to Farnese and adding the note "for the Academicians": "I, N., declare that I dissent in nothing from what the author of these articles, the cardinal, etc., has approved in them on the basis of the words of Christ and the holy Fathers"; or: "I, N., declare that I dissent in nothing from what the author of these articles, the cardinal, etc., has approved in them on the basis of the words of Christ and the holy Fathers, as well as the usage and tradition of the Holy Roman Church." 80

The bishop naturally perceived the captious reservations implicit in these formulas and rejected them without hesitation, "seeing that in this manner one could safely subscribe to all of Luther's books and even to the Koran itself." Through Cortese he proposed a different text:

“I, N., declare that I have read and considered the forty-one articles, which I approve as consonant with the orthodox faith and accepted by the Catholic and Roman Church, and I hold that they must be approved by all.” As an alternative, he instructed Cortese to propose a fourth, shorter wording, “if mine seemed too harsh to him, as mediator between them and me,” omitting the reference to the Roman Church: “I, N., have read the forty-one articles and, approving them all, have signed them.” 81

Now with their backs against the wall, seeing “that matters were nevertheless tightening and had to be brought to a conclusion,” the Academicians finally accepted the first formula proposed by Morone, while seeking one last escape that might preserve their consciences at this moment of dramatic reckoning. They asked that the words “in obedience to the authority of the most reverend cardinals” be added. 82 The bishop refused, “because they showed that they were yielding to our authority and to the times, not to the truth, and wished to reserve for themselves a better opportunity to attack the said articles without blame.” 83

At this point every remaining space for negotiation had been exhausted, even at this final defensive position. The Academicians had no choice but to submit or make their dissent explicit. Determined at last to conclude an affair that had dragged on too long, Morone sent the forty-one articles back to Bologna and asked Contarini to sign them and obtain the signatures of “certain other persons in Bologna not suspected of heresy,” as well as Filippo Valentini, who had promised to do so. 84 In the end, however, the Modenese heterodox could not bring himself to take that step. Perhaps after learning of the new inquisitorial tribunal established in Rome, he preferred to leave the city “without bidding his host farewell,” as Contarini wrote to Morone on 23 July. The cardinal sent Filippo Gheri to Modena to ask Morone’s advice about what should be done and to deliver the letter Valentini had left behind.

Dated 22 July, the letter reflects with extraordinary emotional intensity the tangle of human and religious contradictions in which Valentini, like all the Academicians, was struggling. For an instant it tears apart the dense web of caution, reticence, and dissimulation in which they had wrapped themselves and allows a glimpse into the “most restless peace” and “troubled tranquillity” hidden at the bottom of their consciences and defended by every means. It is worth reading in full: 85

> Your Most Reverend Lordship detained me yesterday, saying that you wished to sign certain articles and that I should sign them as well. Taken entirely by surprise, and more out of reverence for Your Most Reverend Lordship than for any other reason, I did not know what to answer. But after reflecting on my situation, I have thought it best to withdraw somewhat, though not to yield; and so, removed only from Your Most Reverend Lordship's bodily presence, I beg and implore you, by every human and divine consideration and with all the earnestness I possess, to accept me for what I am, and above all as your old and devoted servant. You, who have always shown me far greater goodwill than I could deserve, must not now begin to make yourself the instrument of other men's malicious designs, nor deal with me through wrong or force; for in you alone, after God, I place my hope of being defended from whatever others might seek to inflict upon me. I do not ask what these articles are, who composed them or had them composed, for what reason, who approved them, or what form the subscription is to take. None of these things would matter greatly to me, and Your Most Reverend Lordship's authority alone would suffice. I say only that I cannot see how I have deserved this great honor - or disgrace, whichever it may be - and that I do not understand such matters well enough to be able or obliged to take part in such proceedings. I have always involved myself in them with the utmost restraint, and had now resolved to hear and know nothing more about them, but rather to devote myself with all possible diligence and fidelity to Your Most Reverend Lordship's service. I beg you, if it is possible, not to frustrate that resolve or disturb this most uneasy peace of mine. Should Your Most Reverend Lordship nevertheless have decided otherwise, be pleased to inform me. I remain ready, at your pleasure, to appear wherever you wish, confident that Your Most Reverend Lordship - who in the smallest affair acts with such moderation and justice, so that no one is made, against his will or contrary to right, to pay even the slightest sum - will show all the more proper regard for my station, my service, and, in short, my rights in matters of such very great importance. And with this I conclude, kissing your hands and humbly commending to you my honor and dignity, and all the troubled tranquillity of this brief life of mine.

It was one last, desperate appeal to Contarini not to make himself an instrument of "other men's malicious designs." It reveals both the hopes with which the Academicians had looked to him as a possible interlocutor and their anguished awareness that every space of freedom was closing, even the merely personal and private space in which one might preserve one's own "dignity." They now had to face the dilemma between "wrong or force" and "disgrace" in "matters of such very great importance." Yet of the stark alternatives Valentini set out here - flight or submission - he chose the first only initially, as others did as well, before embarking on the second course. For another fifteen years and more, it would enable him and the entire Modenese group to survive behind the mask of deliberate Nicodemism. In 1557, summoned to Rome during the inquisitorial investigation of Morone, he would finally be forced to flee with Castelvetro toward the Grisons. Yet as late as 1566 it was reported that in Modena "there were many good Christians" - meaning members of the "Lutheran sect" - "but they proceeded prudently and secretly so that they might not be accused, as others had been accused on previous occasions." [86]

Just as Valentini was leaving Bologna, however, the situation changed radically with the bull Licet ab initio of July 21, 1542, which established the Roman Holy Office. [87] A turning point was thus taking shape that would leave an indelible mark on the history of the Church, rooted in political and religious choices diametrically opposed to the "tact and gentleness" that had guided Morone and Contarini. Beyond the pastoral failure and personal rebuff, it was immediately clear to anyone with eyes to see and a mind to understand that the true target of this shift was not the Modenese Academicians, now compelled to bend by fair means or foul, but their bishop - and above all the strategy and method he had tried to advance. From the outset, in other words, the repressive policy developed in Rome was directed not only against heretics but also, and perhaps above all, against anyone who did not share it.

4. The Intervention of the Holy Office

The bull was the outcome of a long process that had begun when Gian Pietro Carafa and his Theatines moved to Venice in the aftermath of the Sack of Rome. There he had quickly transformed his task of supervising priestly ordinations into a full-scale campaign of repression against heretical infiltration of the clergy. [88] This is clearly documented by the famous memorandum he addressed to Clement VII in 1532, in which he reiterated that "the plague of heresy is commonly introduced either through heretical preaching and

books or through long habituation to an evil and dissolute life, from which one easily proceeds to heresy." He thus established an extremely close connection between moral corruption and heterodox deviation, from which followed the identification of Church reform with the eradication of all religious dissent - or at the very least the absolute subordination of the former to the latter. It was a clear strategy, crude perhaps, but pursued with iron determination, and it culminated in 1542 in the establishment of the Roman Holy Office. Around that body a powerful political faction, largely anti-Habsburg, would gradually coalesce, enabling Carafa within a short time to turn the Inquisition into a formidable center of power, rendered virtually untouchable by its role as guardian of Catholic orthodoxy and by the institutional primacy that followed from it. [89]

It is hardly surprising that the first to grasp the meaning of this turning point were those against whom it was directed, beginning with Pole and those whom Beccadelli was just then calling the spirituali of Viterbo. [90] Well informed about events in the papal curia, the English cardinal was in a far better position than Contarini in Bologna to understand what was happening, and through Priuli he warned him of the new situation that had arisen in Rome. [91] Badia did likewise. He delayed expressing his opinion on the Modenese Articuli [92] in a letter in which - as the Venetian cardinal informed Morone on July 23 - he refrained from criticism but warned him that "six cardinals have been appointed over matters of heresy, [93] especially those of Modena, Naples, and Lucca. Since there is now a college, therefore, he does not think it appropriate to sign or to do anything on his own." At this point the Milanese cardinal could only follow the advice of Pole and Badia, withdraw in good order, "proceed no further," and leave the new inquisitors to confront that thorny problem.

In any event, while leaving the final decision to Morone, Contarini sent the forty-one articles back to Modena with his signature, asking him, however, to erase it "for every prudent consideration" should he agree that the matter ought to be referred to the Roman authorities. [94] It was a suggestion dictated by events, and Morone complied by sending Farnese a copy of the confession of faith without Contarini's signature, together with a detailed report whose apologetic undertones betray the embarrassment in which he now found himself. [95] The group gathered around Pole at Viterbo shared that embarrassment, as is evident from the cautious reserve with which news of the new Roman tribunal appears in their correspondence during those weeks. The failure of the moderate strategy into which the two cardinals had poured their energies had in any case become clear well before developments in Rome changed the rules of the game. As Beccadelli wrote to Gualteruzzi on July 22, the day Valentini fled, there was a danger that "in trying to cure Modena, many sick men may be discovered - and God grant that soothing ointments can heal them." [96] "May God help you with those inquisitors of yours and these new heresies," he insisted a week later. "I will tell you the truth: I have concluded that it is safer to believe with simple women and to study Aristotle and Plato than to become entangled in so many new and dangerous doctrines." [97] It was probably these new events, and the abrupt reversal they imposed, that prompted Cortese to postpone his planned journey to Bologna, [98] certainly to meet Contarini. From this point onward, with his role essentially exhausted, Contarini appeared to withdraw from the Modenese affair, [99] whose conclusion his imminent death would prevent him from seeing.

Morone's point of reference now lay elsewhere, although he waited a full ten days before following the Venetian cardinal's advice, reporting the situation to Rome, and requesting instructions. The delay seems inexplicable at first, but acquires a precise meaning in light of the letter he wrote immediately instead, on July 25, the day after receiving the disturbing news Contarini had sent him on the twenty-third. It was addressed to an influential curial cardinal, Marcello Cervini, to whom he had often appealed from Germany in the past for help in governing his diocese. In the letter Morone offered what might appear to be merely a calm account of the affair that had occupied him for two months, yet made not the slightest mention of the new cardinalitial congregation, whose existence he already knew. Indeed, everything suggests that the Milanese cardinal decided to write to Cervini precisely because of what he had learned while pretending not to know it. [100] Seen in this perspective, the letter takes on the exact meaning of a justification, a kind of excusatio non petita for his conduct: the "peaceful way," the "way of gentleness," which had been not only "appropriate" but "necessary," given the "great danger" the city might have faced had proceedings been

conducted "rigorously." With his characteristic political instinct, Morone understood that the inquisitorial tribunal was intended not only to extinguish the centers of heresy in Naples, Lucca, and Modena, [101] but also to strike decisively at the different strategy he had tried to put into practice.

Moreover, a rumor spreading through Modena in early August held that the appointment of the six inquisitors amounted not merely to an implicit repudiation of the course Morone had followed thus far, but also to a gesture of papal distrust toward him. The pope, it was said, had "grown suspicious of His Most Reverend Lordship" because of his "slow procedure"; the bishop's "dissatisfaction" was known, as was his intention "to meddle in it no longer." [102] In this light one can understand why Morone, in his letter to Cervini, pretended to be unaware of the Holy Office while at the same time taking care to assume that, should his strategy fail, the pope - not without placing a "burden" of blame upon him - would send "men who will use methods against them different from those I have used." Above all, aware of the difficulties, and by then also the dangers, he faced, he asked to be replaced in the government of the diocese by "a good and learned bishop who, little by little, will devote himself to uprooting what has little by little taken such deep root." [103] In substance, he was once again affirming his trust in moderation, in long-term action, and in patient persuasion. Yet just as a year earlier his vicar had been certain that the city's heretical disease could be cured if Ochino preached there for a time, Morone now hoped that the spiritual government of Modena might be entrusted to "some man of upright life and rare learning, capable of preaching so as to eradicate these heresies." He suggested Pietro Martire Vermigli, "who is now laboring in Lucca," [104] a man who only a few weeks later would be an exile in Switzerland alongside the Sienese Capuchin.

Having thus tried to protect himself with Cervini and, through him, with the Holy Office before formally referring the matter to Rome, Morone and Cortese made one last attempt to induce the suspects to sign the confession of faith. They may have threatened to implement the brief received in early July and also counted on the support of the Este governor, who exerted pressure upon those men "of great intelligence and spirit and subtle mind" [105] in order to avert the dreaded intervention of the Roman inquisitors and confront them with a fait accompli. But it was all in vain. The affair had by then involved the entire city, and from late July onward it recurs in Lancillotti's chronicle. He was always ready to rail against "certain Academicians in Modena who go about whispering to common people, leading them to interpret certain matters of faith outside the order of Holy Mother Church," and to denounce the danger that his city might become "half Lutheran and heretical." [106] News of the new tribunal of faith had sown panic among the dissenters, who for a moment appeared divided over what course to take. Some hastened, through Cortese, to inform Morone that they were finally willing to sign; others - such as Machella, Porto, who had shortly before written to Sadoleto "under another guise," and Castelvetro - preferred to leave the city and follow Valentini's example. Valentini, however, had already returned to Modena, where on the thirty-first he was "sick in bed." [107] He was not alone in claiming illness: "many other prominent men" did the same, while still others withdrew "to their country estates to have their grain threshed." Lancillotti repeatedly states that about thirty people were summoned to sign the articles under threat of being cited to Rome, among them Bertari, who "is not at all in good spirits," and Bonifacio Valentini, who "wants to sell his books and no longer wishes to study his Holy Scripture, because he says that decent men can no longer study." [108]

The confrontation had therefore reached breaking point, while its repercussions now extended beyond the city walls. "I fear that these disputes - not to say Modenese heresies," Beccadelli wrote to Gualteruzzi on August 9, "will make such a noise that even you will hear the explosion." [109] Those flights finally helped persuade Morone to abandon every further effort. On August 3 he referred the tangled affair to Alessandro Farnese, asking that his letter be shown to the pope "and, if he sees fit, to those Most Reverend deputies," from whom he now awaited instructions. The situation was deadlocked and everyone remained "in fear and silence," yet heresies continued to spread through the city, where "many women and children" had "already been imbued" with them and heterodox books remained in circulation. For his part, Morone shared Cortese's conviction that "these leaders might be killed but could not be made to change." He continued to believe that the best solution was "a good bishop who resides here," that "nothing good would be achieved through violence; rather, greater and irreparable disorder would follow," and that the most effective instrument

remained "tact and learning." In substance, while advising against any intervention by the Holy Office, Morone was asking permission to continue his strategy and strengthen it by placing it under the seal of papal authority, so as to overcome the Academicians' final resistance. [110]

Farnese's answer is unknown, and the decisions taken in Rome cannot therefore be reconstructed. In any case, the Inquisition was not for the moment entrusted with the Modenese problem, and within a few weeks the Academicians finally placed their signatures beneath Contarini's confession of faith. It would nevertheless be misleading to regard that solution as a success for Morone. He was in fact stripped of effective authority and compelled to accept a compromise that allowed him to save appearances, but little more. Not only was his request that some of the inquisitorial cardinals also sign the text, thereby giving it their approval, rejected; the task of bringing the long affair to a conclusion was entrusted to Sadoleto. We have already noted both Sadoleto's independence from Contarini's doctrinal positions and the personal initiative he had taken with the Academicians to probe their opinions and bring them into obedience. He undoubtedly intervened on the pope's explicit orders, and during the two days he spent in Modena at the end of August he was able to impose with prompt firmness the solution for which Morone had labored in vain for three months. Sadoleto's dispatch as legate to France, and the brief stop in his native city required by the journey, also provided a convenient cover for this mission, avoiding an open repudiation of the Milanese cardinal.

In mid-August, while awaiting Sadoleto's arrival, the governor informed the duke that in recent days "the state of affairs" had changed profoundly. [111] On the twenty-fourth Niccolò Machella returned to Modena, [112] followed shortly afterward by Castelvetro - evidence that the tormented problem was approaching at least a precarious resolution. Contarini's death, which occurred at Bologna at that very moment, and the sensational flight of Ochino and Vermigli to evade an inquisitorial summons captured public attention, [113] not without more or less explicit connections being drawn between the two events. In Modena as well, for example, on August 24 Lancillotti recorded the death of the Venetian cardinal, "a most devout person," only to note, after learning of the Ochino affair, the rumor that "even he, although very learned, was beginning to waver." [114] The two episodes shared, to some extent, a common symbolic meaning, if only because of the Venetian cardinal's exceptional intellectual and moral prestige. More than anyone else, he had seemed to embody the demands for reform of the Church and reconciliation with the Protestant world, to which he had devoted all his energies - so much so that he too had ended up in the inquisitors' sights.

5. Between Repression and Nicodemism

The solution achieved through Sadoleto's intervention - he arrived in Modena on August 29 on his way to Avignon to take possession of his legation - was a skillful compromise that allowed Morone to save face. Formally, it rested on the strategy he had devised, since Contarini's text was used and any intervention by the new inquisitorial authorities was avoided. Yet he also had to acknowledge the failure of his attempt to absorb the city's religious dissent painlessly through dialogue and persuasion. Effectively deprived of authority, he had to allow the Modenese cardinal to manage the conclusion of the affair without granting the Academicians even the slightest further room for negotiation. In substance, this was a repetition on a narrow local scale of the illusion Contarini had pursued at Regensburg and of his failure to find a viable way to heal the religious fractures of his age. At neither Regensburg nor Modena, however, did he secure the unanimous support of those spirituali whose own contradictions contained the seeds of divisions that were becoming ever harder to reconcile at the level of shared sensibility and political purpose. Just as the failure at Regensburg had demonstrated, for Rome as for Wittenberg, the political and theological impracticability of the fragile utopias of Italian Evangelism, so the failure at Modena demonstrated its inability to provide an acceptable answer to the religious ferment seething and pressing upward from below, or to find for it an outlet within the Church.

In the following years, precisely because of those failures, all this would become the object of suspicions, accusations, and trials. For the moment, Sadoleto's intervention at least preserved appearances and with them the good name of those prestigious cardinals. It also offered the Academicians a final, slender

protection by granting their request - first advanced in May and later supported by Cortese - that their names be mixed together with those of other Modenese citizens, lest the list of signatories become a list of suspects, culprits, and perhaps, in the future, relapsed heretics. That was all they managed to obtain. After so much resistance, they finally had to bow to the stark alternative Sadoleto placed before them: either sign the articles of faith or face a full inquisitorial trial. All agreed to sign. None followed the path Ochino and Vermigli had indicated in those very days and which Valentini, Machella, Porto, and Castelvetro had at first seemed ready to take; their signatures instead appear at the foot of Contarini's formula. Throughout the summer, through skillful negotiation and combative resistance, the heterodox had tried to avoid formally assenting to a text now far removed from their religious positions and in whose spirit it is difficult to believe they could "still recognize themselves in any way." [115] Only after every possibility of mediation had been exhausted, and with repression looming over them, did all of them - with greater or lesser difficulty - agree publicly to adopt the conformity demanded of them. Privately, however, they did not abandon the tenacious expectations connected with the forthcoming council or the "hope - still alive in 1566 - that one day the evangelical truth, so long persecuted and concealed, must be preached." [116]

From this point of view, the episode of the 1542 confession of faith clearly marks the Nicodemite turn of the Modenese heterodox groups, a development destined in subsequent years to spread to every Italian city. Summoned with others to sign that "Catholic confession [...] of many articles," Ludovico Castelvetro stated with perfect clarity that, for his part, "he would get through it by means of dissimulation." [117] These words capture a defining feature of the Italian Reformation in the sixteenth century: its broad diffusion and equally rapid exhaustion. They also capture the failure of every strategy other than the inquisitorial one, and in some measure the failure of every Catholic reform that could not be reduced to strengthening ecclesiastical authority. [118] This is why the turbulent Modenese affair, played out between May and September 1542, was of decisive importance. It was then that the conflict between competing and incompatible strategies for dealing with religious dissent ended in the victory of the Roman Holy Office. It was then that heterodox movements began to abandon the hope that the Reformation might prevail in Italy too, retreating step by step into the recesses of simulation and dissimulation. And it was then that the attempt to resolve the ongoing theological conflict through irenic reconciliation demonstrated the essential futility of its political and religious premises in the face of increasingly defined and radicalized doctrinal and ecclesiological identities.

The surviving documentation makes it possible to reconstruct the final developments with ease. On August 30, immediately after arriving in the city, Sadoleto met Morone and Cortese at the house of his brother Alfonso. [119] During a tense confrontation lasting "about three hours," and under threat that he would "make a report to His Holiness the pope," the three finally overcame the Academicians' last stubborn resistance. At first the Academicians were willing to sign only "on condition," but eventually agreed that the Conservators should sign as well. [120] On September 1, after the Conservators' own final opposition had been overcome the previous day [121] - and among them were friends and supporters of the dissenters - the city council finally met. The grave suspicions hanging over Modena and Sadoleto's interventions on its behalf were recalled, and the forty-one articles were officially presented under the authority of the pope, [122] without the slightest mention of Contarini or any of the summer's negotiations. The request for signatures was made in the names of Sadoleto, Morone, and Cortese. Prior Giovanni Castelvetro joined them, urging his colleagues to sign and reading a preamble drafted by Sadoleto. Speaking also on behalf of the other two cardinals, it declared the intention of freeing the city from the infamous reputation it bore throughout Italy by attesting the full orthodoxy of its most authoritative citizens and thus dissociating them from the few ignorant and foolish men who upheld heretical doctrines. [123]

The text of the articles reproduced the original draft without any alteration, but the subscription formula, presumably written by Sadoleto, did not adopt those previously suggested by Morone and contained an explicit declaration of submission to the authority of the Roman Church. [124] Only after "much dispute" did the Conservators finally give their assent and decree that all citizens asked to do so were required to sign the formula. Sadoleto signed first, followed in order by Morone and Cortese. [125] That same day, his mission complete, Sadoleto departed for France, [126] and signatures began to be collected, probably in private. This is

suggested by the absence of any mention in Lancillotti's chronicle, [127] although he was quick to deplore the mixing of the magistrates' names with those of men suspected of heresy, whose conduct he perceived as "dissimulated." [128] Francesco Porto was the last to sign, after renewed disputes between the dissenters and the bishop. Morone had initially refused to admit him because of the particularly serious suspicions against him, confirmed by the fact that he had been the last to return to the city, around September 10, among those who had chosen to leave at the end of July. [129] Altogether, forty-four signatures appear beneath Contarini's articles, including those of the three cardinals. About twenty can be attributed to people regarded as suspicious for one reason or another: from the undisputed leaders of the city's heretical dissent, to their supporters, including several rebellious canons, and a group of patricians sensitive to the need for Church reform and ready to extend their protection to the Academicians. [130]

If Lancillotti is to be believed, however, the Academy consisted of a group "more than thirty in number." [131] It is therefore striking that the signatories of the confession of faith do not include figures who had previously been tried by the local Inquisition, such as Marco Caula [132] or Francesco Sighizzi; [133] Alessandro Milani, who in July had been compelled to write Sadoleto in his own defense; Cesare Bellencini, described by the Modenese chronicler as "one of those of the Academy"; [134] the physician Bartolomeo Carandini and the powerful Camillo Molza, who at the end of March 1541 had intervened in Bertari's favor; [135] Antonio Caverdino, one of Molza's dependents, who the year before had gone about saying that "we are free, and not as the ignorant believe"; [136] other prominent citizens, including those who, "having formed a band," had violently attacked the vicar in defense of the Augustinian preacher; Gaspare Ferrari; [137] Ercole Rangoni, who had offered his protection to Camillo Renato; [138] other canons against whom Sigibaldi had continually complained in his letters to the bishop; and the bookseller Antonio Gadaldino. All this once again underscores the failure of Morone's attempt to absorb religious dissent through that confession of faith. It was probably set aside after his departure for Rome at the end of the month, once he had issued a decree intended to restrain the clergy's disorders in the celebration of the liturgy, [139] while fresh disputes concerning Francesco Porto revealed the persistence of the Academicians' resistance.

The long confrontation therefore ended with recourse to a poorly concealed instrument of repression, to which Morone too had to submit, and, on the other side, with the dissenters' adoption of Nicodemism. Far from marking the end of the Modenese heretical movement, the affair was instead a turning point. Forced to take the hidden path of a secret organization, to seek different structures of ecclesial cohesion, and to devise new forms of association and proselytism, the movement would discover fresh and vigorous energies. Gradually, and definitively after the further tightening of repression in 1545 - when "more than fifty learned men" still belonged to it [140] - the Academy would lose its central role. Leaving behind the elite circle of scholars, clerics, and patricians, the heterodox movement would open itself to the world of artisan workshops. In fact, it had already appealed to a broader social base, and many, as the anxious Lancillotti complained, were "common people [...] seduced by those of the Academy." [141] Yet the Academicians had always taken pains to conceal these activities and connections, denying any relationship with the "common people" who went about the city spreading their follies, as Grillenzoni had written to Sadoleto. [142] It was no accident that Sadoleto had tried to exploit these social differences in his preamble to Contarini's formula, attributing the heterodox ferment above all to "the madness and wickedness of a few, mostly obscure men." [143] The Nicodemite choice also meant relaxing such precautions, which had proved insufficient to prevent conflict with ecclesiastical authority. In the following years, the leaders of Modenese heretical dissent would no longer be only men of letters, whether clerical or lay, but also merchants such as Francesco Camorana, Giovanni Bergomozzi, and Giacomo Graziani, and humble craftsmen such as the weavers Giovanni Terrazzano, Paolo da Campogalliano, and Pellegrino Civa, or the shoemakers Bartolomeo Ingoni and Bernardino Pellotti, known as Garapina. [144]

It was therefore in the tormented events surrounding the 1542 confession of faith that the foundations were laid for the Academy's transformation into what would become the community of the Modenese "brethren," with its own ecclesial identity, its collective celebration of the Lord's Supper according to the Calvinist rite, and its forms of mutual assistance. [145] During the bishop's continuing absences, the vicar would

once again have to send him long and alarmed letters about the "Lutheran infection" that, as he wrote on March 1, 1543, had "taken possession of the bodily senses and spiritual taste of this people in general"; about the Academicians' "sect" and their "diabolical synagogue." In his powerless denunciations, alongside the leaders of previous years' dissent - Girolamo Teggia, "the pope of the Lutherans," believed in "as though he were Saint Paul"; Bonifacio Valentini and the canons who followed him; and the Grillenzoni brothers - there would soon appear the names of others, such as Graziani or the carpenter Pietro Montecchio, "the trumpet of the sect." Alarming news would also soon arrive from Ferrara and Bologna of the discovery of dangerous conventicles of "artisan Lutherans." [146]

As for Morone, the Modenese affair deepened his irenicism by making him aware that every pastoral reform also entailed doctrinal choices. Within a few weeks he himself would become personally involved, so deeply as to alter his attitude toward the Academicians and, more generally, his manner of governing the diocese. [147] He thus inaugurated a brief season of intense engagement with the world of the spirituali, one that would leave an indelible mark on the rest of his life and on his fate as the pope who never was. Chapter Five

"Enlightened by the Most Reverend Pole": Trent and the Encounter with the Spirituali

1. The Meeting with the English Cardinal

After the barely disguised failure of the attempt to overcome the dissent of the Modenese Academicians, Morone set out for Rome in mid-September "to receive the hat and the title of the cardinalate." His title was that of cardinal-priest of San Vitale, formerly held by Contarini. Shortly afterward, in early October, word spread in Modena that the pope had decided to entrust the presidency of the forthcoming assembly at Trent to five cardinal-legates. Among the names mentioned were Cortese and Morone, the latter credited with having secured at the Diet of Speyer the final agreement on the council's location. "They have been working on this council for more than twenty years," Lancillotti noted with his customary severity, "and if it is not held this time, it will never be held in our lifetime." [1]

From the day after his elevation to the cardinalate, Morone was regarded within the curial alignments as a representative of the German political and religious sphere. In an opinion requested by the pope while instructions for the legates were being prepared, Tommaso Campeggi argued, for example, that Morone's appointment to the presidency of the council arose above all from the fact that no one knew as thoroughly as he did the cunning, deception, traps, and perfidy of the Protestants. He possessed long experience of the German world, knew whom he could trust, and was more capable of giving instructions than of receiving them. Since there was little chance that the Lutherans would appear at Trent, it seems more likely that the choice of the newly created cardinal was prompted chiefly by the political lucidity and negotiating skill he had displayed in his legations, as well as, of course, by the favor he enjoyed at the imperial court. Rome justified the delay in the legates' departure by the need "to finish providing him with everything required to make him equal to the dignity and rank he now holds and to the charge with which he is being sent." [2] The appointment did not pass without grumbling and envy. On October 12, the Mantuan agent in Rome, Nino Sernini, informed Ercole Gonzaga that two distinguished cardinals - both future conciliar legates and popes - Marcello Cervini and Giovanni Maria Del Monte, showed some resentment. The former displayed the affected piety of a "crooked-necked zealot," while the latter complained that "Morone is too serious a rival and is trying to surpass him." [3] Yet the Milanese cardinal's appointment also shows that, notwithstanding the failures at Regensburg and Modena, he continued to enjoy the pope's complete confidence. In the delicate task of directing the council's proceedings, Paul III placed him alongside two authoritative figures, Pier Paolo Parisio and Reginald Pole. [4] The first brought the experience of a canon lawyer of the highest order; [5] the second owed his appointment to an unequalled reputation for moral integrity, religious zeal, learning, and theological doctrine. This made him an emblematic figure, capable as no one else of embodying the synthesis of reforming commitment and steadfast loyalty to the Church that Paul III wished to present to the world as

the council's purpose. [6] Through these appointments, Pope Farnese also counterbalanced the success Carafa had achieved a few months earlier with the establishment of the Holy Office.

Pole, then forty-two and a cousin of Henry VIII, had refused to approve the king's divorce and the Act of Supremacy, thereby condemning himself to exile in Italy. He had arrived there around 1520 to continue at Padua the studies begun at Oxford under John Colet. In 1536, initially at the king's request - Henry had urged him to write in support of the divorce - Pole dedicated to him a treatise, Pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione, also known as De unitate Ecclesiae and later published in Rome in 1539, in which he set out the political and religious reasons for his dissent. [7] Constantly surrounded by spies and threatened by assassins sent by the English sovereign, whose scanty offspring made Pole's own claims to the succession dangerous, he had been forced to watch helplessly as his closest relatives were condemned to death. At the end of that same year, 1536, he was summoned to Rome to take part in the commission charged with drafting the Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia. Its members included such eminent figures as Gasparo Contarini, Girolamo Aleandro, Gian Pietro Carafa, Federico Fregoso, Tommaso Badia, Gregorio Cortese, Iacopo Sadoleto, and Gian Matteo Giberti, all of whom - with the exception of the last, perhaps because of his illegitimate birth - were destined to receive the red hat. The document, however, remained a dead letter, in part because editions of it soon appeared in Germany. One, equipped with a far from benevolent preface by Johannes Sturm, displayed on its title page the interior of a church in which several cardinals mildly dusted with fox tails, while above the high altar stood a triumphant triptych depicting the pope. [8]

Created a cardinal at the consistory of December 22, 1536, together with Aleandro and Carafa, Pole had twice been appointed papal legate. In 1537 he was sent to Henry VIII, accompanied by Giberti, with the task of promoting peace and England's participation in the council, although of course he was unable to set foot in the kingdom. In 1539 he was sent to Charles V to urge military action against the English king after the latter's excommunication. All Pole's political and religious activity in these years developed in Contarini's shadow. He recognized the Venetian as a guide and master, submitted the manuscript of De unitate Ecclesiae to him, and maintained a dense correspondence with him, often paralleling that between Pole's beloved friend and collaborator Alvise Priuli and Ludovico Beccadelli, Contarini's secretary. Soon recognized in his own right as one of the most authoritative members of the Sacred College, Pole supported Contarini's attempt to restrain the simoniacal practices of major Roman offices such as the Datary and the Apostolic Penitentiary - a veritable "workshop of wickedness" and, in Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga's judgment, one of the chief causes "of the bad name we bear throughout the world." [9] The attempt largely failed, but it strengthened the bond between the two men and reinforced Pole's image as an advocate of courageous Church reform, albeit one lacking a political strategy. This is evident in his elusive unpublished tract De reformatione Ecclesiae, repeatedly reworked and ultimately reduced to a kind of general moral appeal. [10]

At Trent in 1543, when asked how the reform of the Church should be promoted, Morone would reply that "the English cardinal understands the matter well." Pole intended, he said, "to abolish the Chancery in large part and the Penitentiary almost entirely; he would have bishops appointed who knew how to preach, would not give parishes to courtiers, would leave the bishops all their jurisdiction free, and would have worthy men occupy bishoprics, as was done in the primitive Church." [11] The program appears in negative form in Roman pasquinades, according to which "the Englishman | would make Rome spend too sadly," chiefly by "proclaiming quarantines, | [...] correcting the printed psalters, | and [...] furnishing Sixtus's library." [12]

This was presumably the image Morone had of Pole before leaving for Rome and spending several days with him in Viterbo, where he also met Vittoria Colonna. He was there on September 28, 1542, "intending to remain until His Holiness declares when he orders him to proceed to Rome, which he can very conveniently do in two days' journey." [13] He stayed for several days, "to the marvelous satisfaction of our Most Reverend Lord, who has enjoyed his company several times with the greatest delight," as Priuli informed Beccadelli on October 3. After Contarini's death, Beccadelli was considering entering the Milanese cardinal's household, though he ultimately chose Cervini's. [14] Morone and Pole may have known one another during their common years of study at Padua and then met briefly in December of the previous year, while Morone was traveling

to Speyer, in a very different political and religious context. [15] Now everything had changed. It is reasonable to suppose that, besides the prospects for the episcopal assembly they were preparing to preside over, their conversations centered on the tumultuous events of that scorching summer of 1542: not only the Modenese affair, which had ended with the establishment of the Roman Holy Office, and Pope Farnese's unexpected cardinalitial appointments, but above all the political vacuum created by Contarini's death in Bologna on August 24; the disagreement between Contarini and Pole that had emerged in the preceding weeks; and the sensational flights into Calvinist territory of Ochino and Vermigli, the latter rashly proposed by Morone shortly before as his successor in the diocese of Modena. [16] A convergence of judgments and intentions probably began to take shape between the two cardinals at that time. Soon afterward they moved to Rome, where on October 6 Paul III placed the red hat on Morone and Cortese in the church of the Santi Apostoli. [17] Ten days later, on the sixteenth, the three legates were formally invested with their office, and on the nineteenth they received from the pope the cross that symbolized it. [18] On October 22 Priuli wrote to Beccadelli that "my lord [Pole] regards the sweetest and holiest company of Monsignor Morone as the sole grace amid all his labors; he is more than fond of him because of the great gifts of God he discerned in him during the few days Morone recently spent at Viterbo." [19]

Without lingering in Rome, the legates departed between October 26 and 28, at short intervals from one another, on their way to Trent. [20] Morone would later claim that during the journey "we were never together, except at the place where we assembled to make our entrance," [21] namely Rovereto. Indeed, as Pole wrote to Alessandro Farnese from Viterbo on November 1, shortly after Morone had left, they had decided to travel separately and always "in riding dress," "in order to move more expeditiously and quickly," avoiding "ceremonies and entertainments." They originally intended to bypass Siena, Bologna, Mantua, and Verona, stopping only at unavoidable Florence. Six days later the English cardinal was at Pontassieve, where he confirmed "the plan already begun of traveling separately, though not so far apart that we cannot join one another within a day." On November 10 he reached San Michele in Bosco outside Bologna, while Morone had arrived in Modena on the evening of the ninth. He was welcomed by the city authorities and Duke Ercole II d'Este, with whom he met privately two days later to discuss above all "the Union of the charitable institutions and hospitals." He refused to sign its foundation act, to the great embarrassment of the Conservators. [22] The route envisioned by the three papal legates had by then changed and followed the customary road through Bologna, Mantua - where Ercole Gonzaga had invited all of them to stop briefly - and Verona, then onward toward the Brenner Pass. [23] On November 13 Morone arrived at Ostiglia, from which he sent a note to the cardinal of Mantua and the duchess apologizing for being unable to enter the city. [24] Pole, contrary to expectations, did stop there, and was therefore able to meet Ercole Gonzaga and Ascanio Colonna before reaching the vicinity of Verona on the sixteenth. [25] There he rejoined Morone, each with his household in attendance, [26] and together they set out for Trent. A letter sent to Rome on November 19 by Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, bishop of Cava dei Tirreni and commissioner-general of the council, reports that "last night the Most Reverend Morone and the Englishman arrived at Rovereto, twelve miles from Trent." They were waiting only for Parisio before making their solemn entrance into the city, postponed until the twenty-second because of torrential rain. [27]

The manner of the journey and the possibility that the two men met along the way are not trivial questions. According to certain inquisitorial documents, it was precisely then that Flaminio succeeded in initiating a genuine conversion of the Milanese cardinal, which was consolidated over the following weeks at Trent during the exhausting wait for the council to open. The Bolognese heterodox Giovan Battista Scotti would reveal this in a memorandum submitted to Marcello Cervini and Ambrogio Catarino Politi in the early 1550s. Scotti was then the leader of a large heretical group in Bologna and was very close to Pole, Ascanio and Vittoria Colonna, and the whole circle of the spirituali. [28] In that brief document he claimed to have learned from several sources that Morone had been "a man of good life, reputation, and standing, and a Catholic person, until, while bishop of Modena, he was sent by the Holy Apostolic See to Trent," but that during the journey in Pole's company "he changed his opinion concerning matters of the Catholic faith." [29] Still more precise was Scotti's deposition of July 1555, in which he reported what Castelvetro and other Modenese heretics had told him: [30]

> Through the work and efforts of the aforesaid Most Reverend Cardinal Pole, by means of the words of Messer Marcantonio Flaminio, the Most Reverend Cardinal Morone was seduced into the errors named above. [...] They said this occurred during the journey made by the said Most Reverend Pole to Trent for the council. [...] As they spoke together about matters of faith during that journey, the aforesaid Flaminio began trying to persuade Morone of Lutheran doctrine and argued with him so insistently that in the end he seduced him. Those Modenese men told me that the Most Reverend Cardinal Pole allowed Flaminio to do and say as he pleased, and then, when they appealed to him as judge of their differences, he confirmed Flaminio's opinions.

Pole and Flaminio had thus agreed upon and carried out a kind of division of roles, one that appears to echo similar discussions held shortly before in Naples under the guidance of Juan de Valdés. As we shall see, those discussions had marked a decisive turning point in the religious path of Flaminio himself and of others. During his interrogations, naturally, Morone would reject such accusations, sheltering behind inaccuracies in the witness's account and maintaining that they had never traveled together before Rovereto.

It is difficult, however, to believe his claim that he could not remember whether Flaminio was among Pole's household. [31] Morone himself could not deny having repeatedly discussed religious questions at Trent with Flaminio and Priuli, the latter of whom "very often spoke of spiritual matters," and above all the "article of justification," over which there was "much dispute, and scarcely anything else was spoken of in the city at that time." The inquisitors would in any event be quick to seize upon the half-admission that escaped the cardinal concerning the outcome of those conversations with Pole and Flaminio, when he alluded enigmatically to "this disagreement and this compromise." By explaining that "our discussions [...] generally took the form of a certain spiritual conversation rather than controversies and disputes," [32] he provided an exceptionally effective definition of Flaminio's pedagogy: the forms of association and proselytism it produced; the manner in which it lived and communicated the intense spirituality of The Benefit of Christ; and the way it legitimized the book's doctrinal contents while bypassing "controversies and disputes," thereby concealing or weakening the elements of theological dissent and implicit anti-institutional polemic that ran through them. To understand the origins and substance of what the inquisitors would regard as the Milanese cardinal's sudden "seduction," it is therefore necessary to pause briefly over the English cardinal's religious outlook, its evolution, and the role Flaminio played in it after his Neapolitan sojourn in the school of the Spanish exile.

2. The "Church of Viterbo" and Juan de Valdés

We have seen how the relations of esteem, friendship, and collaboration that united Pole and Contarini, while remaining personally cordial, began to crack after the Diet of Regensburg, though for the time being without undermining their shared intentions. It is reasonable to suppose that, even at that stage, the English cardinal's withdrawal from the political clash taking place in the Roman curia over the positions adopted by his Venetian colleague was motivated by the emergence of new doctrinal choices. These would become clearer the following year, when Contarini asked for Pole's judgment on the Articuli orthodoxae professionis - a judgment the English cardinal sought to avoid because of the new situation created by the establishment of the Holy Office. [33]
Yet his reluctance seems to conceal a religious disagreement, also attested by the dispatch of the Valdesian catechism to the Modenese Academicians, who throughout the summer had resisted the bishop's efforts to lead them back into the Catholic fold. At the root of that disagreement lay the letters through which, early in 1541, Flaminio had gradually drawn Pole, by way of Priuli, into the doctrines he had learned in the school of Juan de Valdés, of whom he had by then become the most sensitive and authoritative interpreter. [34] The humanist from Serravalle had probably read some of Valdés's writings in Giberti's Verona, and that first encounter may have prompted him in 1538 to travel to Caserta as the guest of an early Valdesian, Giovan Francesco Alois, and then to Naples. His religious outlook emerges clearly from the epistolary debate in which he distanced himself from Contarini and Seripando on the crucial questions of justifying grace, free will, and predestination that were inflaming religious controversy. [35]

Through his network of friendships and acquaintances, Flaminio helped attract to Naples in the early 1540s several leading figures from throughout Italy and drew them into Valdés's teaching. That teaching also echoed in the sermons of Vermigli, the Spanish exile's "close friend" and prior of San Pietro ad Aram, and of Ochino, who at precisely that time began to place at the center of his preaching "that blessed article of justification [...] but with such skill and caution that he gave scandal to no one." [36] Among those who followed Flaminio's example and sought in Naples an answer to their religious anxieties were the Florentine Pietro Carnesecchi, formerly a very young secretary of Clement VII, who would recall that he had then been "introduced into the kingdom of God"; [37] the Venetian Vittore Soranzo, Pietro Bembo's protégé and designated successor in the bishopric of Bergamo; the man of letters Iacopo Bonfadio from the Lake Garda region; the Apulian merchant Donato Rullo; and the Calabrian priest Apollonio Merenda, himself a former pupil of Bembo at Padua. They joined the numerous members of the Neapolitan aristocracy already won over to those doctrines, among them bishops, barons, great nobles, noblewomen, and senior officials of the Spanish government.

Pole and Priuli's favorable response to Flaminio's proselytism gave the Valdesian group, for the first time, an immensely authoritative point of reference at the summit of the ecclesiastical institution. This made it possible not only to expand the movement but also to open new political prospects for it. That may help explain why Flaminio himself - together with Carnesecchi and others - left Naples even before the Spanish exile's death in July 1541 and eventually arrived at Viterbo, where the English cardinal had moved after his appointment as legate of the Patrimony of Saint Peter. In that secluded setting, far from the urgencies of curial politics, the so-called Ecclesia viterbiensis began to take shape. Along with Pole, Priuli, and other members of the English cardinal's household, it included Flaminio, Carnesecchi, Merenda, and Soranzo, as well as Vittoria Colonna, who moved expressly to the convent of Santa Caterina. They all engaged in intense religious reflection on the issues at the center of contemporary disputes, nourished daily by readings from Valdés's works and occasionally from those of the great reformers beyond the Alps, as well as by Flaminio's lessons on the Pauline epistles and the Gospels. In those months, following the method he had learned from the Spanish exile, Flaminio devoted himself to writing scriptural commentaries such as the Meditations and Prayers Composed upon Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans, [38] in which "he spoke at length of justification in accordance with the little book The Benefit of Christ," [39] and an initial version of "three discourses on Saint Matthew." In January 1542 he sent the latter to Giulia Gonzaga, Valdés's favorite disciple, [40] through Merenda, who was often charged with carrying letters, manuscripts, and books in the dense exchange then taking place between Viterbo and Naples. [41] A few months later, on April 7, 1542, Priuli informed Beccadelli that "Messer Marcantonio has finished expounding Saint Matthew and has begun Saint John." That these lessons formed part of a comprehensive program of reading the Gospel texts is also suggested by Flaminio's request for certain notes by Contarini on Saint Paul's epistles, which he wished to consult for the commentaries he was preparing on the basis of Valdés's unpublished work. [42] During his final Roman trial, the Florentine protonotary would recall that in the English cardinal's residence "Flaminio had with him some of Valdés's writings, and I believe they were the book of Considerations and the commentary on the Psalms, which he was translating from Spanish into Italian" at Giulia Gonzaga's request. [43]

Carnesecchi had initiated Merenda into Valdesian doctrines, first in Naples and later in Viterbo, repeatedly arranging for him "to speak with Flaminio," who gave him "his little book The Benefit of Christ" and several of the Spanish exile's Considerations and Questions and Answers. Ten years later Merenda confessed to the inquisitors that in those lessons Flaminio "said most openly that only through the blood of Jesus Christ did we have remission of sins and eternal life, and not through our works," adding that "neither the cardinal nor anyone else ever answered him to the contrary." [44] Everything, he said, "seemed holy and good to me, although at the time I understood only the outer shell, for they never spoke to me of the consequences that follow from that doctrine of justification, nor did I reflect upon them. All the more so because they told me that although works did not justify us, but only the blood of Jesus Christ, works were nevertheless necessary as the fruits of faith." [45] In Naples, Giulia Gonzaga also read to Merenda "several times from Valdés's Considerations and Questions, which we praised very highly." [46] She used the occasion to question him about the opinions "concerning justification" that Pole, Priuli, and Colonna were developing

under Flaminio's instruction. Flaminio was evidently keeping her informed about the response to his teaching. "I replied that I knew nothing except that I never heard him contradict Flaminio," Merenda would testify, adding that Pole and Priuli "were men from whom nothing could be learned on this subject." Asked "what the lord cardinal said about Valdés's matters," he replied that "he had read some of the Considerations and Questions and appeared to like them very much." [47]

On December 8, 1541, confirming the dense exchange of books and news between the two Valdesian centers of Naples and Viterbo, Colonna informed Donna Giulia that she had heard "Your Ladyship has sent the exposition on Saint Paul, which was greatly desired, especially by me, since I have greater need of it." [48] The following day, in a letter to Contarini, the English cardinal wrote that every evening Flaminio "feeds me and the better part of my household with that food which does not perish, in such a way that I cannot remember ever having felt greater consolation or greater edification." He invited Contarini to join that "holy and useful company," which his presence would turn into "a paradise in this world." [49] This idyllic image of peace and contemplation served to protect their religious discussions and the atmosphere of freedom in which they took place from indiscreet curiosity, as well as their cautious proselytism and the protection they extended to heterodox figures pursued by the Inquisition, such as Giovan Battista Scotti in 1543 or Pietro Carnesecchi in 1546. According to the Burgundian Dominican Gabriel Martenet, who had experienced it personally, Pole devoted great effort - either directly or through members of his household - to winning new disciples, inducing them to abandon the Catholic faith through gentle words and sometimes through grants of money placed at his disposal by Vittoria Colonna. It was for this purpose, Martenet claimed, that she lived alone, moving from one convent to another and supporting the poor students of what was effectively the English cardinal's "school." [50] In Naples and Rome it soon became known that "the followers of Valdés were in communication with Marcantonio Flaminio and looked to the [...] English cardinal as their leader," [51] and that "many learned men inclined toward Lutheran doctrine gathered" at Pole's residence. [52] Through them, that Spanish exile, "inventor of new and erroneous opinions," had "infected [...] all Italy with heresy." [53]

This is not the place to provide a full account of the roots, development, and various strands of Valdesian doctrine, [54] which matured amid the cultural and religious ferment of early sixteenth-century Spain: the messianic tensions and Franciscan missionary impulses connected with the conquest of the New World; the enduring myths of crusade against the Turk; the Catholic universalism of Charles V's empire; the humanist philology promoted by the new University of Alcalá de Henares, a vital center of an Erasmianism still dominant at the summit of power; but also the first appearance of heresies from beyond the Alps; the ferment of an unregulated female piety expressed in the prophetic mysticism of beatas and revelanderas who attained great popularity; the expulsion of the Jews and the suspicious inquisitorial campaign against the conversos; and the spiritualist ferment of the alumbrados, especially widespread among the latter, who claimed exemption from obedience to the Church by virtue of the divine light illuminating their hearts. Valdés himself had been born into a family from Cuenca whose Jewish origins had prompted repeated inquisitorial interventions, punishing Judaizing practices with death sentences and humiliating penalties. A summary of his thought will suffice here, especially in order to understand why it enjoyed such success in Italy during the two middle decades of the century and for a brief season succeeded in winning over Morone as well.

Already in his first work, the Diálogo de doctrina christiana, published at Alcalá in 1529 - the only work printed during his lifetime - Erasmianism, Lutheranism, and alumbradismo fused in a text whose simplicity and clarity were only apparent. Written in Castilian and intended as a catechism, it was addressed to a broad public and designed to guide its first steps toward Christian perfection with pedagogical prudence. [55] What allowed these different inspirations to coexist, and indeed enabled their overlapping layers to mask the work's most radical contents, was its insistence on the fundamental principle of Christian freedom, which served as a kind of common denominator. This was enough to confuse inquisitors always ready to classify every doctrinal deviation under the label of Lutheran heresy. For that reason too, the Erasmian outer form of the Diálogo was not merely artificial in relation to its reformed content; that content in turn rested without apparent friction upon the alumbrado spiritualism that formed its deeper substratum. Such a synthesis was

possible only because of the author's skill in blending impulses that were partly different and at times opposed.

Erasmianism pointed toward individual reform as the indispensable premise of Church reform. It called upon each person to assume moral commitment and responsibility, rejected the contentious spirit of theologians and the authoritarianism of institutional churches, and urged Christians to lay down the weapons of doctrinal conflict, emphasize what united rather than what divided them, and tolerate differences of opinion on questions that were as laden with exegetical difficulties as they were substantially useless in directing the religious lives of the faithful toward what truly mattered for salvation: love of neighbor, a sense of justice, and consistency of conduct. In Valdés's case, this Erasmianism had been nourished in his youth by personal relations and mutual esteem with the great humanist of Rotterdam, also through his brother Alfonso, Charles V's Latin secretary, who was constantly present at German diets and therefore exceptionally well informed about the Protestant world. In 1527 Alfonso had written the Diálogo de las cosas ocurridas en Roma, a virtual unofficial manifesto of Habsburg policy that explained the terrible Sack of Rome as a deserved divine punishment. The Luther who appeared in literal quotations in Valdés's Diálogo was not the rigid theologian of anti-papal invective, the polemic over the bondage of the will, or the disputes with Zwingli over the Eucharist, but the Luther of justifying grace, who had had the courage to challenge a papal Church forgetful of the very foundations of Christian life.

More deeply concealed, but no less important, was the presence in those pages of alumbradismo. [56] Valdés had been introduced to it while still a "boy" in the household of the Marquis of Villena at Escalona, under the instruction of Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz, the movement's chief leader alongside Isabel de la Cruz. Although alumbradismo had native roots and had appeared well before Luther, inquisitors assimilated it to the Saxon reformer's doctrines, especially after its condemnation in the Edict of Toledo of 1525. Such a judgment was encouraged by the centrality alumbrados assigned to grace and their denial of the meritorious value of works; their polemic against the priestly and monastic states, the sacraments, canon law, excommunications, indulgences and papal bulls, Masses, and all the vain "little devotions" that nourished traditional piety, including the rosary, holy water, the sign of the cross, veneration of the Virgin and the saints, sacred images, vows, pilgrimages, bodily penances, and other useless restraints that curtailed Christian freedom. In reality, the alumbrados differed from Lutheranism in rejecting its scripturalism and in believing that only the inward revelation of the Spirit, dependent upon the divine will, could disclose the mysteries of faith even to the humble and ignorant. Indeed, they went far beyond Lutheranism by denying hell and by theorizing and practicing an esoteric gradualism with neophytes in small groups, guiding them step by step along a path of perfection protected by deliberate Nicodemite caution, while avoiding prophetic messianism, visionary ecstasies, and any public denunciation of the Church's degeneration and abuses. [57] With great acuity, Melchor Cano would perceive in 1559 echoes of these subversive doctrines in the Comentarios of Bartolomé Carranza, who had known and associated with Valdés before becoming Pole's friend and collaborator at Trent in 1546-47 and in England during the 1550s, and finally archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain in 1557, on the eve of an interminable inquisitorial trial. [58]

The true Christian, Valdés wrote, is the "spiritual man," one who "tastes and feels spiritual things and delights and finds peace in them, while setting no value upon bodily and external things," irrespective of whether he is a cleric or layman. [59] As such, he knows "evangelical freedom" and the divine mysteries not by reason, [60] but through "secret inspirations attributed to the Holy Spirit," the foundation and guarantee of a "wisdom come from heaven, [...] so that the more the soul possesses this wisdom, the more it knows, feels, and tastes." It is a wisdom bestowed, not acquired, because it depends upon the light of the Holy Spirit and not upon study. [61] The potential consequences of such premises hardly need emphasis. Valdés's awareness of them emerges from his exhortation to preserve certain doctrines "impressed and enclosed within the soul" rather than "written in books"; to obey civil and religious authorities "in order wholly to preserve Christian peace and concord"; but with the warning that "as for the precepts of the Church, [...] in order to do our duty we are bound to observe them outwardly, and in so doing, even unwillingly, we perform everything we owe the Church, because it judges only external conduct." [62]

It is therefore unsurprising that, after an initial approval, the Spanish inquisitors detected the strong odor of Lutheranism seeping through the Diálogo de doctrina christiana's proclaimed Erasmianism and placed Valdés on trial. He escaped by fleeing to Italy and Rome, where he was entrusted with delicate missions at the papal curia under the title of imperial secretary, operating as diplomatic agent, spy, and informer in the service of Charles V and the viceroy of Naples, Don Pedro de Toledo. [63] Though he had received minor orders so that he could enjoy ecclesiastical benefices, he lived in Rome as "a modest and well-bred courtier." Carnesecchi and Soranzo, respectively secretary and chamberlain to Clement VII, knew him there as "a gentleman of sword and cloak." Endimio Calandra, Ercole Gonzaga's close collaborator, would recall that "in Rome Valdés frequented the household of the cardinal my master, but nothing was said of his speaking about religion until after he went to Naples, where he later caused a very great stir." [64] Valdés ultimately moved to Naples after the election of Paul III, having inherited certain revenues from his brother, who died at Vienna in 1532. He did not spare the new pope's nepotism, and grew ever more convinced that it was the emperor's task "to set the world in order and reform the Church" [65] in preparation for the forthcoming council. There he wrote the Diálogo de la lengua, a foundational text of modern Castilian, which Spanish rule was also spreading through Italy. His political passions, however, were destined rapidly to fade, and with them his relations with leading figures of the pro-Habsburg party in Italy, such as Cardinals Ercole Gonzaga and Benedetto Accolti, both likewise at the forefront of conflict with Pope Farnese. He was instead increasingly absorbed by a religious reflection of great originality and depth - enough, in Marcel Bataillon's judgment, to make him one of the most authentic religious geniuses of the sixteenth century. [66] It remained open to new developments and capable of being appropriated in different ways, was entrusted to a substantial body of writings, and became the point of reference for the many disciples gathered around his teaching. During the Neapolitan years, the eclectic synthesis of the Diálogo ultimately developed into a radical spiritualism arising from the very foundation of alumbrado doctrine: the mysteries of religion can be known through divine inspiration, not through Scripture. Anyone who seeks to understand them armed only with fallacious "human prudence," the Spanish exile wrote, is like a blind man wandering at night through a forest; and anyone who presumes to do so on the basis of scriptural study relies rashly upon a "dim candle," whereas only the inward light of the Spirit shines "like the sun." [67] That light alone can give the Christian certainty that he is saved by "the grace and mercy of God through the faith infused by His Spirit into our hearts." [68] Only "inspired and revealed faith, by giving man peace of conscience together with the joy that comes through the Holy Spirit, assures him that he stands in God's grace, that he is a son of God, and that he is an heir to eternal life." [69]

For this reason the believer should turn to the biblical text only as an "interpreter or commentary" after having examined and understood "the book of his own soul." [70] He should use it as an elementary "alphabet" with which to verify his certainties, and then leave it "to other beginners, attending himself to inward inspirations, taking God's own Spirit as his teacher and using Holy Scripture as a holy conversation that brings him refreshment." [71] "Divine wisdom," Valdés wrote, "is inspired and not taught, [...] it comes through experience and not through learning, and through evidence and not through opinion." [72] Clearly alumbrado in origin, these premises challenged the normative authority of every institutional church and undermined every form of religious certainty. There are, indeed, many ways of living the "Christian life," which "is not acquired through knowledge but through experience," by "hearing the voice of Christ inwardly." [73] It therefore takes the form of a subjective journey with different rhythms and outcomes depending on the unfathomable unfolding of the Spirit's inward revelation. Awareness that individual Christian experiences follow varied and multiple paths and reach different conclusions requires the avoidance of polemics and controversies, which can produce only conflict and division, while never constraining the absolute inward freedom of the "elect of God." [74] They possess a "secret knowledge" denied to most, "hidden [...] secret and veiled," which must be guarded and transmitted with prudence in order to avoid scandal. [75] For that reason "the Christian calling belongs to few, [...] because those who follow the world will always be more numerous than those who follow Christ," Valdés wrote, observing that "the greatest harm suffered by the Christian cause [...] has been caused by men's attempt to extend it to many, although it is reserved for few, if not for the very few." [76]

There is therefore no orthodoxy defined once and for all, because Christian faith is not a doctrine but a "form of doctrine"; not a systematic theology but a religious inspiration whose truth is guaranteed only by peace of conscience. [77] Hence Valdés's metaphor of the ecclesial community as a "most beautiful and richly furnished palace" to which every believer is invited. Some are content to contemplate it from outside; others enter the porticoes; others dare to proceed into the innermost chambers; and still others, "being bold and strong, wish even to look [...] inside the chests." All are authentic Christians in their own way, since "even those who remain outside looking in are not strangers to the divine palace." [78]

It is therefore understandable that Valdés refrained from entrusting his thought to systematic treatises. Such works were incompatible both with the differing religious maturity of believers, determined by the different unfolding of divine illumination in each, and with the understanding of the "secrets of God" not as assent to a code of truths but as an uninterrupted process that erased the very concept of orthodoxy. He preferred instead to consign his reflections to scattered writings: commentaries on the Psalms, the Gospels, and the Pauline epistles; considerations, letters, brief treatises, questions and answers - the pieces of a mosaic whose overall coherence emerges only gradually.

Always careful to avoid rash polemics against the Roman Church, these texts sought to stimulate independent reflection rather than assert truths, to suggest methods rather than contents, and to entrust every certainty solely to the inward light of the Spirit. The very title of the Christian Alphabet points to this cautious catechetical dimension. Valdés explained it to Giulia Gonzaga by saying that, in proposing certain "rules," he did not mean to bind her "to them, because my intention is that you use them only as a Christian alphabet by means of which you may attain Christian perfection." [79] An alphabet, then, or at most an elementary vocabulary, to be followed by further study progressing to grammar, syntax, and finally rhetoric, [80] in a gradual reduction of Christian doctrine to its bare essentials. From this followed a condemnation of every authoritarian imposition of faith and a drastic reduction of the fundamentalia fidei, progressively purified of the "superstitious observances" of "false religion," [81] until possible outcomes of extreme radicalism came into view.

Indeed, several figures connected in various ways with Valdés arrived at Anabaptist and anti-Trinitarian doctrines, [82] carrying to their ultimate consequences the communicative strategy based on cautious initiatory gradualism that he had first practiced. He guided neophytes through a slow process of Christian regeneration coinciding with the restoration of the divine nature corrupted by Adam's sin. [83] That alone leads to knowledge of the mysteries denied to the wise of this world, mysteries that must be revealed prudently and discreetly to those "weak in faith," treating them "with consideration" [84] like children, little by little, [85] so as not to blind rather than illuminate them. Thus, Valdés wrote, "if a Christian who understands the evangelical truth and knows the Christian truth finds himself among persons who are in the process of understanding one or the other, by adapting himself to their incapacity and frailty he will do as they do, skillfully seeking to draw them toward knowledge of both." [86]

3. "Pastor of Noble and Illustrious Persons"

Pietro Carnesecchi's interrogations in 1566-67 allow us to follow the first steps of Valdesian initiation - a process that would also involve Morone - along a gradual path marked by pauses and retreats, in which every new certainty generated new problems, nourished by conversations and reading. Only after observing the protonotary's reactions, with every "skill and caution" so as to cause "scandal to no one," [87] did Valdés and Flaminio press him more insistently on the question of justification. Yet they always emphasized its orthodoxy, its scriptural foundation, and the unanimous agreement of "all the principal Doctors of the Church." When those Doctors had spoken of the meritorious value of works, they explained, they had meant only to avert the risk that coarse and ignorant people might adopt "an excessively lax and licentious way of life, mocking works, as one sees the peoples of Germany have done." This explicit distancing from the Reformation served to confirm "that justification by faith was entirely Catholic," [88] only for doubts about purgatory and confession to be insinuated once the disciple had accepted that doctrine. [89] Carnesecchi ultimately accepted these "inferences and consequences," aided by reading books by the reformers beyond

the Alps that Flaminio gave him, although he deplored their anti-papal invectives. For this reason the Valdesian writings and The Benefit of Christ that the protonotary read in Naples taught the doctrine "simply, without even hinting at, much less touching, any of the aforesaid conclusions." Even then, however, he had begun to understand "its conformity with the opinions of the heretics" and to perceive the Spanish exile's reticence, as he "dissimulated in order not to scandalize his disciples." [90]

In the short introduction to his catechism for children, Valdés himself suggested restricting initial instruction to justification by faith, reserving knowledge of the sacraments and even of the Trinity for the progressive unfolding of the Spirit's light, "when it shall please God to call them, with the spiritual and inward calling, to the grace of the Gospel." [91] This was the first and indispensable point of departure, the unavoidable premise of Christian life, which he identified with "the government of the Holy Spirit," granted "by God's particular and special favor" to those whom He "has foreknown and predestined" in accordance with the unfathomable decrees of His will. [92] He advised similar prudence in the Christian Alphabet, exhorting Donna Giulia to preserve in the silence of her heart the "most Christian truths" entrusted to those pages and to avoid rash proselytizing, because only "doctrine cooked and digested within the soul bears fruit," whereas "doctrine that immediately issues from the mouth does not nourish the soul." [93]

Nicodemism thus became an indispensable instrument both of cautious proselytism and of self-defense against violent intrusions into the realm of conscience by the guardians of ecclesiastical orthodoxies. Since knowledge of the divine mysteries is reserved for few, Valdés wrote, true Christians must humble themselves by "dissimulating their spiritual dignity when it is necessary to dissimulate it, showing themselves equal to other men, [...] so that just as the saints of the world strive to proclaim their perfections, they strive to conceal their own perfections." [94] Hence the exhortation not to do in the presence of those who regard something as unlawful what one would rightly consider permissible, lest they be induced to mistake Christian freedom - the heart of Christianity - for carnal license. [95] This was an explicit theorization of the esoteric pedagogy practiced within the group gathered around the Spanish exile. His extraordinary personal charisma helps explain why encountering him - not only his words and writings, but also his looks and gestures - marked for many an unforgettable experience destined to shape their choices in life profoundly.

A famous letter written by Bonfadio to Carnesecchi in the summer of 1541 bears witness to this. In it he asked, almost in dismay, what his own destiny would be. "Where shall we go now that Signor Valdés is dead?" he asked emotionally, his eyes still filled with the "delightful gardens" of Chiaia overlooking "the broad gulf of that smiling sea" in Naples's "eternal spring," the setting of their conversations. "It has certainly been a great loss to us and to the world, for Signor Valdés was one of the rare men of Europe, and the writings he left on Saint Paul's epistles and the Psalms of David will bear the fullest witness to it," he wrote, recalling the fascination of his teaching. "He was without doubt, in his deeds, his words, and all his counsels, a complete man. With a small part of his soul he governed his weak and slender body; with the greater part, and with his pure intellect, almost as though outside the body, he remained always raised to contemplation of the truth and of divine things." [96]

A few years later, in his reply to Della Casa's Index published at Venice in 1549, Pier Paolo Vergerio recalled the "many disciples, men of standing," left by "the Spaniard Valdés, who bore great fruit in the Church of Naples" through his extraordinary ability to "preach Jesus Christ sincerely and prudently." He also announced the forthcoming publication of several of Valdés's writings. [97] He was referring to the catechism, which had just appeared at Basel, and to the One Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations, which Valdés had entrusted to Celio Secondo Curione, who published them at Basel in 1550. Curione praised the Spaniard as "of noble kin, honorable rank, and a splendid knight of Caesar, but an even more honorable and splendid knight of Christ," a man who had known how to guide many consciences toward the rediscovery of the Gospel: [98]

> It seemed that this man had been given by God as a teacher and pastor of noble and illustrious persons. Yet he possessed such kindness and charity that he made himself a debtor of his talent to every humble, lowly, and unlearned person, and became all things to all men in order to win them all for Christ. And not

only this: he also gave light to some of the most famous preachers in Italy, as I know from having associated with those very men.

Valdés's insistence on justification by faith and the stream of exiles arriving from Italy initially led the Swiss reformers to regard the Spanish exile as a teacher capable of directing his disciples toward the new Churches. From the 1560s onward, however, when Calvin himself read the One Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations in French translation and saw Valdés's refusal to recognize Scripture - and its authorized interpreters - as the key to religious truth, they finally understood Valdesianism's incompatibility with Protestant theology and denounced its radical outcomes among Flemish Anabaptists and Italian anti-Trinitarians. [99] Some exiles, by contrast, still looking back across the Alps toward Italy, attacked the unacceptable compromises of many Valdesian adherents. They seemed, Francesco Negri wrote in 1550, "to have created a new school of Christianity arranged in their own manner, in which they do not deny that man's justification is through Jesus Christ, indeed, but then refuse to admit the consequences that necessarily follow from it, because they wish by this means still to sustain the papacy," thus producing "a mixture of Christian and papist things." [100] The former Benedictine acutely perceived how Valdesian spiritualism managed to combine acceptance of fundamental premises of the Protestant Reformation with steadfast loyalty to the Roman Church.

When the inquisitors asked Carnesecchi what the "institutio Ioannis Valdesii" in which he had been involved actually was, he emphasized the Spanish exile's extreme discretion in teaching it "so plainly, without padding it with circumstances or inferences, like one who made it his profession to edify and not to destroy." [101] For this reason Valdés had accepted certain articles of Luther's doctrine, "but by no means all of them universally," deploring above all the fact that Luther had "separated himself from the Catholic Church, because such separation can arise only from sheer pride, which cannot coexist with charity and the Spirit of God." According to the Valdesians, legitimate "diversity of opinions" must not be confused with the inadmissible "withdrawal of obedience" for which the Saxon reformer was responsible. "Although he had spoken rightly in many matters and correctly interpreted many passages of Scripture, it could not therefore be concluded that he possessed the Spirit of God except insofar as God had granted it to him for the benefit and edification of His elect," the protonotary explained, clarifying why his Neapolitan teachers felt authorized to take "certain things from his doctrine tanquam aurum ex stercore colligentes et caetera (ut aiunt) reddebant coquo [as though gathering flecks of gold from dung and sending the rest, as they say, back to the kitchen]." [102]

Many years later, these words still echoed what Flaminio himself had written to Carnesecchi in 1545 to restrain his pro-Lutheran enthusiasm. He urged him not to be deceived by the Protestants' "false doctrine" and vain "imaginations." Blinded by "human pride, which loves novelty and hates the common paths," they had set themselves up as "most bitter judges of their neighbors, condemning as impious the universal sense and perpetual usage of the Church, and everyone who does not make himself a servant of their opinions." Hence Flaminio's prayer that God would free them from "this arrogance and these bitter zeals," giving them "charity and gentleness of spirit, and such humility that they refrain from rashly judging the doctrines and usages of the Church." [103] He was convinced that every religious rupture and every clash of opposing faiths could only be harmful.

> My lord, he concluded, if we do not wish to be shipwrecked upon these most dangerous rocks, let us humble ourselves in the sight of God, allowing no argument, however plausible it may appear, to induce us to separate ourselves from the unity of the Catholic Church. [...] For if we attempt to judge divine things by human reasoning, we shall be abandoned by God; and in this contentious age we shall attach ourselves so completely to one party and hate the other so deeply that we shall lose judgment and charity altogether, calling light darkness and darkness light. Persuading ourselves that we are rich and blessed, we shall be poor, wretched, and miserable because we do not know how to separate the precious from the vile - a knowledge that cannot be learned without the Spirit of Christ.

These words and ideas conceal the very essence of Valdesianism: its ability to discourage dramatic ruptures; to offer a calm answer to the doubts and anxieties tormenting many minds during the years marked by the uncertainty and hope surrounding the first convocations of the Council of Trent; to take different

forms and arrive at divergent outcomes; and to absorb multiple contributions without ever losing its fundamental coherence. Hence its success in the 1540s, attested by the broad circulation of The Benefit of Christ, not least because the "gentle" doctrine entrusted to those pages made it possible to

avoid difficult choices and painful ruptures; to nourish certainty of salvation without breaking with sacramental practices and the public profession of faith; to weaken the entire doctrinal apparatus over which the different confessional orthodoxies were clashing - the sacraments, purgatory, indulgences, the veneration of saints, papal authority, and so forth - and to entrust the destiny of the Church to divine providence rather than to the contingencies of human history. Within it, after all, there existed and had always existed a minority Church of true Christians, of the elect, even if at times it had been reduced to the seven thousand men who had refused to worship idols, [104] as Valdés had taught Carnesecchi in 1540-41, [105] and this was the Church to which the spirituali were certain they belonged. For this reason Pole said of Martin Luther "that he seemed more learned than the others, but that they were tiresome and spiteful in so many of their curses," [106] while Soranzo, with an ironic sense of superiority, "used to call Luther his good old man," or else "the ocean" that had fed all the heresies, "just as rivers receive their waters from the sea: [...] Zwinglians, Calvinists, Anabaptists, and others." [107] These words reveal, among other things, an awareness of the irreparable internal divisions within the Protestant world and help explain Valdés's disciples' defense of the unity of the Church.

Indeed, it was precisely Valdesianism's fundamental incompatibility with the Protestant Reformation that at least partly explains its success among men of letters, aristocrats, and great prelates. That refined doctrine seemed able to show many people a practicable path, precisely because it "destroyed none of the things ordinarily maintained by the holy Catholic Church." [108] At the same time it opened unlimited spaces of inward freedom for anyone who embraced faith in the exclusive saving value of grace. "The true Christian had a peaceful and tranquil conscience," secure in the certainty that the elect had been predestined by God, Camillo Orsini - a "close friend" of Pole, Flaminio, and Priuli - used to say. According to Carnesecchi, Orsini had formerly lived "timid and fearful and [...] had devoted himself to mortifying his body with hair shirts, scourging, and fasting, thinking that his salvation consisted in this." Later, however, as would also happen to Vittoria Colonna, [109] "having looked toward the light of the Gospel," he had "made himself more secure and tranquil in his conscience than before, trusting not so much in his own works as in the grace and mercy of God." He therefore conducted himself in such a way as to be "regarded as a good Christian both by Catholics and by those suspected of heresy," partly because "on the one hand he spoke very freely of faith, the grace of God, and predestination, [...] being very sure of his salvation, and on the other he was most religious and devout in observing the constitutions and decrees of the Church." [110]

The political weakness of such religious orientations cannot, however, be overlooked, for they ultimately entrusted the reform of the Church to God's unfathomable designs rather than to human action. Clear proof came when Pole withdrew from Trent at the end of 1546 rather than sign the canon on justification. His disciple Vittoria Colonna commented on the event by rejoicing with Carnesecchi "as though it had turned out wonderfully well for the said lord, saying that God had almost miraculously disposed and ordained matters in this way so that the cardinal would not have taken part in that decree." [111] The Tridentine débâcle, like Pole's failure to be elected in the conclave of 1549, would thus come to be experienced as a sign of the divine will, to be regarded with steadfast faith and humility of heart. At the end of May 1554, while in Brussels awaiting permission to land in England, Reginald Pole had to answer a cautious reproach from Morone for his constant withdrawal from action and retreat into his "private studies," founded on the conviction "that God in His providence and omnipotence does everything" and that one need only await the unfolding of His will "standing, as they say, with one's hands at one's belt." In fact, Pole evaded the question, weakly explaining that he was "always waiting to be summoned and commanded by those to whom God has given authority to command me in all that concerns the honor of His Divine Majesty and their own true honor and benefit." It was a profession of absolute obedience to the papal authority of which he would soon become a victim, but it did not address the crucial problem raised by his friend. [112]

It is therefore unsurprising that the political strategies of the spirituali were ultimately supplanted by prophetic expectations according to which the cardinalis anglus or anglicus was destined to become the angelic pope foretold by the Joachimite tradition. This emerges from testimony given on July 13, 1556, in the inquisitorial prison at Ripetta by a disconcerting figure, the Vercelli priest Lorenzo Davidico - to whom we shall return - who had associated with the spirituali between the late 1540s and the early 1550s. [113] On that

occasion he reported that Cardinal Bernardino Maffei, too, had harbored suspicions about Pole and had made no secret of regarding Julius III himself as "half a Lutheran," a man who relied upon the "visions and revelations" of a German prophetess placed at his side by "three great Lutherans" who were "the pope's ruin." Nevertheless, Maffei had supposedly concluded that he preferred "the papacy of Pope Julius to what that of the Englishman would be, for in him there is not all the spirit and goodness that you think, because [...] he is suspect on three or four articles, as are some members of his household," naming Priuli, Morone, and "certain gentlemen." [114] Such news was calculated to make the inquisitors' mouths water, Davidico thought. He added that Priuli had shown him a manuscript entitled Vita angelici papae et tractatus de reformatione Ecclesiae, in which Pole was depicted in papal robes, illuminated by a ray of light and surmounted by three angels bearing the inscription "hic est verus israelita in quo dolus non est, [115] angelicus papa a Deo missus et electus [this is a true Israelite in whom there is no deceit, the angelic pope sent and chosen by God]," while the dove of the Holy Spirit perched above his shoulder and whispered into his ear. [116] The book contained a list of the popes of the preceding hundred years, each accompanied by twelve lines emphasizing their vices in contrast to Pole's virtues, placing "all the vices in the others and all the virtues in him."

The verses were said to have been composed in the early 1550s by a mysterious gentleman who, at Priuli's request, resorted to astrology, "revelations, and constellations to learn the outcome of the papacy with regard to his cardinal," ultimately reaching the conclusion that Pole would be the angelic pope. A papal coat of arms was also prepared for him, attesting that after what had happened in the conclave, the true and authentic vicar of Christ "in the eyes of God" was the English cardinal, whose proclamation lacked only the "outward ceremonies"; and that therefore "until he is proclaimed the angelic pope, [...] the bride remains a widow and without a visible bridegroom." [117] Priuli himself was said to have shown Davidico that book in an effort to convince him that Julius III's election was illegitimate: "There are two: one is elected pope by God and by men and refuses; the other is elected only by men and accepts the papacy. Which of the two seems to you the legitimate pope?" The reports are astonishing, to say the least, yet too detailed and too consistent with the religious outcome of the small and by then languishing group of spirituali gathered around Pole to be dismissed as pure inventions of Don Lorenzo's fertile imagination. It is enough to observe that the title of the book suggests that it contained the unpublished treatise De reformatione Ecclesiae on which the English cardinal continued to work throughout his life, intending to entrust to it the elusive essence of his reform program should he be elected to the throne of Peter.

4. "He Was Seduced by Flaminio"

The new and liberating doctrine into which Pole and Flaminio initiated Morone at Trent was therefore essentially Valdesian, although he did not necessarily draw all the theological, sacramental, and ecclesiological implications of justification by faith. [118] It is significant, for example, that when he tried to sound out the English cardinal's opinions on purgatory, saying that he had learned that many people even in Italy did not believe in its existence, Pole answered that those who denied it were "most presumptuous and rash, since the Church maintains it." [119] When Apollonio Merenda, arriving in Naples at the beginning of 1542 to deliver some of Flaminio's writings to Giulia Gonzaga, told her that he did not know whether Pole had read them, the noblewoman "replied that the lord cardinal was most prudent and, being a cardinal, wished to show that he did not dissent from the common opinions of the others." [120] Still more explicit was her answer to the doubts instilled in Merenda during the journey by a Spaniard who, besides giving him a copy of the Italian translation of Urbanus Rhegius's Novae doctrinae ad veterem collatio, published in 1540, had made him understand the subversive consequences of the doctrine of justification by faith, revealing how it "cast everything down." [121]

> She [Giulia Gonzaga] answered me in these or similar words: "Did you not know that before?" When I told her I did not, she replied that I did not understand it properly, since only the blood of Christ cleanses us of our sins and wins paradise and eternal life for us, and those who believe this through God's gift are the ones who perform better works and live better. [...] I told her that this destroyed purgatory and indulgences, and she, almost laughing, replied that I should not speak of such destructions unless I wished to suffer.

The prudence that Valdés had recommended to Donna Giulia, and which she in turn recommended to Merenda, would nevertheless be relaxed among the spirituali of Viterbo, where Pole's adherence to Valdesian doctrines began to foster cautious proselytism. On the eve of the first convocations of the Council of Trent, the small "Viterbese company" took an active role in the turbulent religious landscape of those years. This is documented, for example, by the sending of the Valdesian catechism to the Modenese Academicians, thereby supporting their resistance to their bishop. [122] It may also have been an attempt to open a dialogue with them and guide their dissent toward Valdesian outcomes. A few months later, toward the end of 1542, shortly after arriving in Trent, Pole and Priuli suggested to Morone that he entrust preaching in his diocese to the Dominican Bernardo Bartoli, one of the first to be won over to their doctrines. [123] After returning to the Church, Bartoli would not hesitate to claim that the English cardinal, aided by his companions and the "great quantity of Lutheran books" he kept in his house, had tried to lead many other members of the order astray by criticizing their venerated master Saint Thomas, since "this scholastic theology did not permit one to see and know the truth of justification as explained in the Lutheran manner." Pole had therefore urged them to preach "the pure and simple Gospel and nothing else," explaining that "this was the preaching of the apostles, and that no other philosophical doctrines or natural arguments should be mixed with it," but that they should instead emphasize the benefit of Christ and "justification understood in the Lutheran manner." Still more compromising was his advice not to worry about the grave "errors" that might arise from that doctrine, because, he said, "when a thing is true one must not consider what follows from it," and to preach from the pulpit "this righteousness of Christ without scandal, without destroying anything, saying that whoever knows this truth frees himself from every error on his own." [124]

Many other examples could be cited to document the political commitment of the Viterbese group: spreading Valdesian doctrines, circulating books and ideas, creating support and expectations around them, and drawing into the current of that spirituality the many forms of dissent that had not yet reached a definitive ecclesiological rupture. It was probably the imminent convocation of the council after the agreements at Speyer, followed by Pole's appointment as one of the papal legates, that mobilized their energies to seize that opportunity: to promote a reform of the Church that would truly affect its infected body, keep open the path of dialogue with the Protestants, avert irreversible condemnations, and at the same time legitimize the positions of the spirituali. It was an ambitious task aimed first of all at involving cardinals, bishops, and council fathers, but also at clergy and laity troubled by doubts and anxieties and eagerly awaiting the decisions of Trent. It is in this context that one can understand the provocative imprudence with which Flaminio, a guest of Cardinal Gonzaga at Mantua together with Pole during the journey to Trent, commented on the sensational news of Ochino's and Vermigli's flight by declaring publicly during a banquet "that the apostles of Italy had departed," without anyone "replying or saying anything." [125]

Seen from this perspective, the cautious proselytism of Pole and Flaminio played a significant role between the failure at Regensburg and the approval of the decree on justification in January 1546. It was an extremely brief interval, but a decisive one in the religious history of those years, when a new militant spirit seemed to animate the Viterbese group. A persistent historiographical image has confined that group within the airless outlines of a tiny circle of high prelates, pale men of letters, sensitive noblewomen, and delicate protonotaries, as devoted to justification by faith as they were attached to their benefices and privileges, eager to confine within an elite experience religious anxieties that were certainly real and even agonizing, but whose own contradictions prevented their wider circulation. Yet it was precisely from the "Church of Viterbo" that there emerged not only the final redaction but also the plan to publish, together with other Valdesian works, The Benefit of Christ, whose extraordinary success throughout the peninsula in the following years demonstrates its ability to interpret religious needs shared at both the summit and the base of society.

That new militant spirit appears all the more clearly because it departed from the original Valdesian matrix and contradicted the vocation to silence theorized by Flaminio and Pole, a man "cui nihil erat tam proprium quam tacere [to whom nothing was so characteristic as silence]," in Seripando's judgment. [126] The humanist from Serravalle offered a true apology for reserve in what he wrote to Donna Giulia on January 14,

1542, accompanying certain of his "discourses" with a letter rich in Valdesian expressions and still marked by the vivid memory of their "common master" and his "holy soul." [127] Yet the effort to obtain a favorable opinion from authoritative prelates such as Giberti, Badia, and Contarini himself on the contents of The Benefit of Christ before having it printed [128] documents the attempt to build broad support around the positions that the English cardinal was preparing to take at Trent.

A similar effort was made to involve Morone in those positions, taking advantage of the intense conversations imposed by the legation on the prospects of the council and the reform of the Church in order to lead him to find in Valdesian spiritualism new premises and motivations for his political irenicism. The precise time and manner in which this occurred cannot be known, but there is no doubt that within the following weeks many people perceived him as changed. In the judgment of the Dominican Gabriel Martenet, for example, a turning point in Morone's religious orientation occurred during the conciliar legation: he became a close friend of Pole precisely through his initiation into the "new dogmas." [129] Giacomo Giacomelli, bishop of Belcastro, who had the opportunity to discuss these matters with him at Trent, came away with the impression that Morone was raving, so fully did he agree with the heretics on the doctrine of grace and free will, attributing everything to grace and nothing to free will. He added that this opinion was also shared by other authoritative cardinals such as Contarini, Badia, and Pole. Giacomelli himself had been scandalized, but had been unable to make Morone abandon that erroneous doctrine. When he tried to involve another friend and member of Morone's household, Scipione Bongalli, bishop of Civita Castellana, the cardinal persisted in asserting that the Lutherans were right on this question, attributing everything to grace. [130]

These fragmentary reports nevertheless make it possible to understand the meaning that Morone's encounter with Pole and Flaminio in the autumn and winter of 1542-43 assumed for the Milanese cardinal, and the turning point it marked for a man who, at Regensburg and then at Modena, had already witnessed the impossibility of keeping doctrinal confrontation with the reformers beyond the Alps and the heterodox in Italy within Contarini's limits of irenicism and moderation. The change was destined to exhaust itself very quickly because of the grave risks that immediately became clear when Morone sought to transfer its doctrinal substance to the pastoral sphere. Yet it also established a friendship with Pole that would endure until the latter's death. Witnesses later called to testify against the Milanese cardinal would agree in recalling a clear transformation in his religious attitudes beginning in the spring of 1543. After he entered the circle of the English cardinal's "dear and secret friends and familiars," they "proclaimed him and revered him as an angel from heaven and listened to him as to an oracle." [131]

Those who encountered Morone at the time could not fail to notice that he too lost no opportunity to say "the greatest things in praise of the Most Reverend Cardinal Pole, and among other things how he had been enlightened by him concerning this matter of justification." He openly declared "that he had previously been a bitter enemy of this opinion, but after speaking and becoming acquainted with Monsignor Pole he embraced this doctrine as a most holy thing." These words would be spoken by the Florentine Dominican Bernardo Bartoli, according to whom the Milanese cardinal had once been an enemy of the Lutheran sect but had now been converted - erat conversus - and had received the illumination that enabled him to understand that justification could come only through Christ. [132] "The said Most Reverend Morone," Bartoli would repeat, "rejoiced in this article and light newly learned from His Most Reverend Lordship [...] and in having been enlightened in it by the Most Reverend Pole, whom he greatly exalted in these matters." [133] "Light," "enlightened": these are words that point back to the alumbrado matrix of Valdesian spiritualism and evoke Morone's encounter with Pole as a genuine experience of conversion. [134] Carnesecchi, although he would deny ever having discussed with Morone "the opinion of justification by faith according to Valdés" or any other "dogma, but rather [...] the things of God in general, for example His providence," would recall the great "affection" that from then on bound the cardinal to Flaminio and Priuli, partly because of "their dependence upon the Most Illustrious Cardinal Pole, who was his very close friend." [135] It was a profound friendship "in spirit," like the one Morone began at that time to cultivate with Giulia Gonzaga, although "without ever speaking or writing to one another." [136]

During the months he spent at Trent, Morone's enthusiasm - and perhaps also the imprudence of a neophyte - led him to adopt compromising positions. One day, for example, while those at his table were discussing Paul's verse, "if you are led by the Spirit, you are no longer under the law" (Gal. 5:18), he declared himself convinced, together with an early Valdesian such as Pietro Antonio Di Capua, archbishop of Otranto, "that a person may be so full of the Spirit that he is not subject to the human laws of the Church." Views of this kind were destined to spread to some of his closest collaborators, such as the Modenese Don Domenico Morando, himself "imbued with this false doctrine of justification." In a conversation with Bartoli in May 1543, Morando would assert "that without this new light of the Lutherans it was difficult to avoid the doctrine of the Pelagians" and would attack the abuses of the Apostolic Penitentiary, declaring that "he regarded it as a bad thing," thus leaving the impression "that he had a touch of Lutheranism." [137]

Another figure close to Morone at the time, Bishop Scipione Bongalli, would state that "his conversation was often about his belief that the court did not live as it should, and he always, always spoke of this reform usque ad fastidium [to the point of tedium]." When asked to specify what reform he had in mind, Morone replied that "the English cardinal understands it well; he went to see him often and they loved one another greatly." [138] Suspicion was also aroused by the fact that, when speaking about the Germans, the Milanese cardinal "said that we had given them great cause to become heretics and that if Rome had set itself in order" - that is, "been reformed in life and morals" - "they would easily have returned to the faith." [139] Bongalli would also report another incident that occurred at Morone's table: an actual physical clash between Bishop Dionigi Zannettini, the well-known Grechetto, always ready to denounce heretics and heresies, and the heterodox preacher Andrea da Volterra. [140] It supposedly happened during a theological discussion in which the latter assailed his interlocutor "with disorderly vehemence," provoking his "great anger" to the point that Zannettini laid hands on him. Morone permitted no one to intervene and tolerated without batting an eye "the scant reverence shown to the prelacy." [141]

After his arrest in June 1557, the Milanese cardinal would emphasize that in 1543 Valdés "was not regarded as a heretic" [142] and that only later had he "heard him greatly condemned [...] as the author of the heresies of Naples." [143] Don Ippolito Chizzola, a canon regular of the Lateran, had used very similar words in his depositions of 1549 when he told the Roman inquisitors that "for a long time the things of Valdés and those of Flaminio passed through everyone's hands as Catholic." [144] It is nevertheless difficult to fit Morone's words and conduct within the reassuring framework offered by his confessio. After his arrest he would try to explain that only the hope of inducing the Lutherans to attend the council had led him "even in public on some occasions to appear to defend their side in certain matters," because he believed it useful "that there should be someone in Italy whom they did not wholly abhor," and because "suspicion could never arise against me, since I had labored for so many years in the service of this holy see." [145] In fact, both the heterodox of Modena and the Valdesians of Naples were well informed about his new religious identity. Flaminio himself announced to the Modenese the "good news that their bishop, that is the Most Reverend Morone, had become one of them and loved them," [146] while the Neapolitan Valdesians were informed from Trent "of his beautiful mind and beautiful spirit, of his being in love with God and not with the things of the world, and of his showing himself well able to grasp justification through Christ." [147]

It was in those very weeks, at Trent and on the eve of the council's opening, that Flaminio gave Morone a manuscript copy of The Benefit of Christ, which he was now preparing for publication, together with transcriptions of other unpublished works by himself, Valdés, and Cardinal Fregoso: letters and short treatises intended to deepen Morone's religious crisis and make him doctrinally conscious of it. [148] After the catechism that the cardinal had recently received from the Modenese Academicians, these included The One Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations, which he would deny ever having read; a Balance of Man's Debt to God, a commentary on Matthew 23:37 almost certainly written by Flaminio, a copy of which would also be found in the early 1550s among the heretical books Vittore Soranzo had ordered hidden at Bergamo; [149] and a seventy-five-folio booklet entitled A Most Effective Confirmation of the Truth of the Christian Faith, whose original, Morone himself would state, "was given to me by Messer Marcantonio Flaminio, and I believe it to be a work of Valdés." [150] Other manuscripts received from the humanist of Serravalle included the

commentary on the Psalms - "he told me that it was a fine book and that I should read it" - and the Preguntas, or Questions and Answers. [151] It is worth emphasizing that all these works, with the exception of the commentary on the Psalms, had already been translated into Italian, most likely by Flaminio himself, who had also written commentaries and paraphrases of the Psalms in the past. [152]

It was probably at this very time, taking the Valdesian writings as his model, that Morone began to compose for his own "exercise and instruction" expositions of "four or five Psalms" and of the epistles of Saint Peter. He would later attempt to protect himself in relation to them by saying that he had not "properly revised" them: "I desire and pray that, should there be anything that might displease, it be interpreted favorably, because I submit everything to proper censure, besides which they were unfinished." [153] Fortunately for him, the inquisitors were unable to find those commentaries, behind which one may discern the inspiration of Flaminio, who, when giving him some of his writings, had suggested that he practice "composing meditations." [154] A few months earlier, while instructing Pole in Valdesian doctrines, Flaminio had also suggested that he write commentaries on the Psalms, a task to which the English cardinal devoted himself "assiduously" in the spring of 1541, as appears from Priuli's letter to Beccadelli of May 20. "He has told me that he has had and still has occasion to speak of all these matters, namely de iustificatione, de fide, de operibus, de lege [of justification, faith, works, and law]," Priuli concluded, assuring him that Contarini and Badia would be the first to see the result of his work, "in order to obtain their most holy and learned opinion." [155] Some of these unpublished commentaries have survived and, through careful comparative study, have made it possible to perceive the profound changes - all in a Valdesian direction - from the De unitate Ecclesiae. [156] Some scholars, by contrast, have regarded that work as a definitive synthesis of Pole's doctrines, allegedly free of all Valdesian influence despite the numerous sources examined in the preceding pages. [157]

Priuli too had a small book in which he was writing an interpretation of the Psalms. Someone would later leaf through it without his knowledge in England and react with astonishment and concern upon discovering its heterodox contents. [158] Earlier still, the Valdesian seed that Flaminio had planted in Carnesecchi in 1540-41 had begun "bearing fruit" through the reading of books such as "Erasmus's Annotations on the New Testament and Marcantonio Flaminio's Psalms," followed at Viterbo by Butzer's commentary on the Gospel of Matthew and Luther's commentary on the Psalms. [159] Valdés himself had theorized the preparatory character of meditation on the Psalms and had written a Comentario a los Salmos as an instrument of his initiatory pedagogy. [160] From Savonarola onward, moreover, commentaries on the Psalms - especially the seven penitential Psalms, with their emphasis on divine mercy - enjoyed great public success, as suggested by the fact that Pietro Aretino's The Seven Penitential Psalms of David went through no fewer than ten editions between 1534 and 1545. [161]

None of Morone's commentaries on the Psalms has survived. Yet the very fact that a man of action such as he, always immersed in the contingencies and urgencies of politics, used that long pause at Trent to compose religious meditations attests the intensity of his involvement in the Valdesian spirituality he learned in the charismatic school of Pole and Flaminio. Although brief, as we shall see, [162] it radically affected his destiny as a man and a cardinal.

Chapter Six

"Spiritual Conversation": Giovanni Morone and Vittoria Colonna

1. Another Illustrious Conversion

The religious turning point experienced by the Milanese cardinal in 1542-43 is confirmed by his correspondence with Vittoria Colonna. It began precisely at that time, along the thread of spiritual complicity that filters through the often obscure language of the marchioness of Pescara, whose is the only voice we can hear, since Morone's letters - perhaps not accidentally - have been lost. Colonna too had recently undergone a dazzling encounter with Pole, which had overturned the religious choices she had made after the death of her husband, Francesco Ferdinando d'Avalos, marquis of Pescara. From that time, "wholly given to the spirit," the noblewoman had lived an experience marked by the ascetic rigor of the Capuchin reform and Bernardino Ochino, whose sermons she attended at San Lorenzo in Damaso in Rome in 1534-35. [1] Her journeys of 1537-38 between Ferrara, Bologna, Florence, Pisa, and Lucca seem to have followed the stages of the Sienese friar's "marvelous sermons," [2] thus revealing even then her need for a guide, a master of faith who would continue to characterize her spiritual life in the future. [3]

It was not in Ochino, however, but in Pole that the marchioness of Pescara ultimately identified the man to whom she owed her liberating discovery of the "benefit of Christ." "I owe His Most Reverend Lordship the health of my soul and that of my body, for the one was in danger through superstition and the other through bad governance," she wrote to Giulia Gonzaga from Viterbo on December 8, 1541, [4] where, in Carnesecchi's judgment, she had withdrawn "to devote herself to serving God more quietly than she could in Rome." [5] In the eyes of the inquisitors there could be no doubt that those words meant that the marchioness had learned those heresies in Pole's school, while the embarrassed comment of the Florentine protonotary seemed calculated to confirm their certainty. [6]

> Before the marchioness became a friend of the cardinal, she afflicted herself so severely with fasting, hair shirts, and other forms of mortification of the flesh that she had reduced herself almost to skin and bone. She perhaps did this by placing too much confidence in such works, imagining that true piety and religion, and therefore the salvation of her soul, consisted in them. But after the cardinal admonished her that by using such austerity and severity against her body she offended God rather than otherwise, [...] the said lady began to withdraw from so austere a life, gradually returning to a reasonable and honorable moderation.

That by "superstition" Colonna meant the dogmas and rites of the Catholic faith would be confirmed to the inquisitors by the words with which Carnesecchi himself sought to credit Giulia Gonzaga with having freed him from a superstitious and false religion, only then having to admit that he meant the opinions on justification ex sola fide that he had learned from Valdés through Gonzaga. [7]
In a memorial composed in 1551, the already mentioned Giovan Battista Scotti directly linked Pole and Colonna, describing him as her "father and spiritual master in matters of religion," as she herself was accustomed to say, "praising and exalting to the stars this cardinal's doctrine and holiness." [8] Pole was said to have taught her not only justification by faith alone, the uselessness of works for salvation, the certainty of grace, and predestination, but also the denial of purgatory, "suffrages for the faithful dead, indulgences, the invocation of saints, vows, and other Lutheran articles." When she met Scotti in Rome in 1545, the marchioness of Pescara herself had spoken of the English cardinal as her "spiritual father and master, exalting him with praise both for doctrine and for conduct and showing that she depended wholly and entirely upon him in doctrine and action." She had revealed herself as "a most thorough Lutheran, but shrewd enough not to disclose herself in this way to everyone." [9] Shortly afterward, while discussing justification with her, Apollonio Merenda observed that "she appeared to hold it as in The Benefit of Christ," and she advised him to read Luther's commentary on one of Saint Paul's epistles, which, apart from its anti-papal "curses," contained "most beautiful things." [10] "She spoke so warmly" of Christ's Passion, he added, "that she clearly showed herself to depend wholly upon it and not upon her own works; and above all she never

seemed to tire of praising the lord cardinal of England." [11] Morone too would recall that his conversations with Colonna often centered on "the Most Reverend Pole, from whom she once told me she had received her salvation, because he had strengthened her and withdrawn her from many vain fantasies." [12] Finally, around 1542, she herself confessed to Fra Bernardo Bartoli that she "believed this justification through the persuasions of the cardinal of England," [13] and wrote of it to Morone in unequivocal terms on December 22 of that year, [14] recalling

> The chaos of ignorance in which I was and the labyrinth of errors through which I walked securely, clothed in that gold which glitters and cries aloud without standing firm at the touchstone of faith or being refined in the fire of true charity, my body continually in motion to find rest and my mind in agitation to obtain peace. And God willed that through him [Pole] He should say to me: "Fiat lux," and show me that I am nothing and that in Christ I find everything. [...] And God knows how hard I struggle to keep the excessive abundance of my heart from spilling onto this page.

Although she had associated with him before, the first letter in which Colonna refers to her meetings with Pole dates from February 1540. His "conversation is always in heaven, and only for the benefit of others does he regard and care for the earth," she wrote. [15] It was then that her correspondence with Marguerite of Navarre and Vergerio began, [16] revealing a significant change in her religious attitudes. This prompted Anne de Montmorency, grand constable of France, to say that a manuscript of the marchioness's Spiritual Rhymes sent to the French queen "contained many things against the faith of Jesus Christ." [17] The close bond "according to the spirit" that she then established with Pole, the "most upright and sincere minister of God, [...] immersed and plunged" in the "infinite and immeasurable magnitude of Christ," [18] thus formed the premise of their common sojourn at Viterbo the following year. There, far from indiscreet eyes and public duties, both Colonna and the English cardinal could live out a religious turning point that the Holy Office was quick to perceive.

From the outset her social rank and literary fame assured the marchioness a prominent role among the spirituali. Within that group she found not only an answer to her religious anxieties but also an outlet for a crisis triggered by the experience of grief. From devout asceticism and the rigor of "a life ostentatiously contemplative - as has been acutely observed - but in fact highly active in every sphere, political, religious, and literary," [19] the marchioness finally arrived at the doctrine of justification by faith alone, learned through the "fragrance of Christ" that breathed from Pole's "living voice," as she wrote to him in 1544. [20] Her involvement, under his guidance, in Valdesian spirituality emerges clearly in her writings. First among them are the Spiritual Rhymes, with their insistent references to "living faith," "pure and ardent faith," "supernatural divine faith," and "true and humble faith"; [21] to the duty of each person to appear before Christ "armed with faith alone," since He "regards neither merit | nor unworthy nature, and sees only | the love that kindles and spurs such boldness"; [22] and to the warning that "if anyone trusts in frail mortal work, | with our first father he vainly aspires | to nothing but receiving fresh deception." [23]

Clear signs of religious complicity emerge from the already mentioned letter Colonna sent to Giulia Gonzaga on December 8, 1541, three months after moving to Viterbo. In it she hoped that she might "confer with her, indeed truly learn what God through excellent means had communicated to her." [24] The meaning of the allusion would be clarified by Carnesecchi, who said he could not "imagine that the said lady meant anything other than the doctrine and instruction that Lady Giulia had received through Valdés, although I do not know for certain what the marchioness otherwise thought of the writings and opinions of the said Valdés." [25] Varchi's judgment was therefore far from arbitrary when, in one of his Spiritual Sonnets, he placed the "lofty Colonna" beside not only Caterina Cibo and Bembo but also "good Valdés, to whom | the road leading to heaven was so well known." [26] One need only read the marchioness of Pescara's Meditation on the Passion of Christ - prompted by a book that taught her to "examine Christ crucified" - to grasp how powerfully the Valdesian message transmitted by Pole had worked within her and within her spiritual vocabulary itself. Through it she had learned to recognize "the open and secret roads of this earth, showing how much we must suspect the broad and spacious ways taught by human prudence, which lead whoever remains upon them to a precipice and eternal perdition, and how we must follow the narrow and constricted ways of faith, which are most secure and lead us to eternal salvation." [27] A truly initiatory language, dense

with allusions and implicit complicities, permeates all of Colonna's correspondence with the English cardinal.

We have already had occasion to refer to the forms of association and doctrinal contents around which the Viterbese fellowship was then organized. [28] Pole and Colonna met frequently, often alone, "without arbiters and without witnesses," and in those conversations the outlines gradually emerged of a faith founded upon the certainty of living a privileged experience and upon the guarantee of eternal salvation it offered, [29] but also distant from Reformed theology and from any desire to break with the Roman Church. Carnesecchi would summarize its salient features as follows. [30]

> I do not remember that any dogma other than justification by faith was spoken of or discussed between us and that lady; nor could I say exactly under what conditions she held even that. It is enough that in her conversations she attributed much to grace and faith, while on the other hand in her life and actions she showed that she placed great value upon works, giving large alms and practicing charity universally toward everyone. In this she observed and followed the counsel that she said the cardinal, whom she believed like an oracle, had given her: namely, that she should devote herself to believing as though she were to be saved by faith alone, and on the other hand devote herself to acting as though her salvation consisted in works.

These words reveal a cautious and reserved attitude, a kind of preference for implicit meaning and for an esoteric message that, at differing levels of awareness, ran through these religious orientations. They often matured through intense human relationships or were mediated by the charisma of exceptional figures, such as the enigmatic English cardinal. In July 1546 Colonna once more professed her gratitude to him, evoking him as "wholly absorbed and eternally raised" in the "excessive bounty and superabundant greatness of love" of divine grace. [31] Although highly significant for understanding the climate of expectation, hope, and complicity then established among the spirituali, Colonna's letters do not allow her role within the Ecclesia viterbiensis to be defined clearly. Her privileged relationship and "spiritual service" [32] to Pole, and her desire almost to merge with and disappear into the light of what she had learned from him, at times seem to exhaust their content.

Inquisitorial documentation, however, makes it possible to break through this subordinate image, entirely confined to the plane of inward experience and capable of outward expression only through spiritual verse, devotional writings, and edifying letters. [33] It instead opens a few windows onto the marchioness of Pescara's active commitment, together with Pole and the other Viterbese, to disseminating books and seeking opportunities for intervention and proselytism. Particularly significant from this perspective was her role during the Diet of Regensburg. While she was at Orvieto, "joyful in her prayers and contemplations," Bembo sent her a copy of Contarini's long letter on justification, which was also delivered at that time to eminent cardinals. [34] "The lady marchioness received it [...] most gratefully," Priuli wrote to Beccadelli on July 15. [35] At Orvieto she showed a copy to Fra Bernardo Bartoli, telling him that Pole "had defended it as a good thing in consistory"; and in the autumn, together with Bartoli and the English cardinal, she met the Venetian cardinal at Viterbo on his return from Germany. [36]

Other documents confirm the active interlocutory role Colonna assumed during this period within the group of spirituali. Her presence can be glimpsed, for example, among the English cardinal's "friends" who in the spring of 1542 read "to the very great satisfaction of everyone" the "passage from Saint Bernard" indicated by Contarini [37] and destined to find a place in the final version of The Benefit of Christ. On June 20 Pole replied evasively, in the name "of this entire company of ours here, and especially of the Most Illustrious Lady Marchioness," to the attempt to involve him in the Modenese affair. His comments on the Articuli orthodoxae professionis, delivered to Viterbo at the beginning of July, [38] have been lost. It is significant, however, that the Venetian cardinal's further reply - the long letter De poenitentia written on the eve of his death [39] - ended by inviting Pole to "examine and weigh everything carefully" together with "his holy and learned company, including the lady marchioness." [40] There can be no doubt that the short "note" the marchioness soon afterward sent to Bologna, enclosed with Priuli's letter to Beccadelli of August 14, referred precisely to the De poenitentia. [41] Contarini's death a few days later, learned with great sorrow at Viterbo, [42] cut short this long-distance debate, which had by then become not only sterile but dangerous, as appears from Pole's insistence on the advisability of discussing "orally" such a "matter, certainly worthy of no small

consideration." [43] Confirmation is supplied by the concern with which, after Contarini's death, Priuli urged Beccadelli to keep Pole's replies to the Modenese Articuli and the De poenitentia confidential, preventing them from falling under indiscreet eyes: "It will likewise be well for you to do the same with the note I sent you from the lady marchioness, written on that subject." [44]

In those same days Bernardino Ochino took the road into exile. From Florence on August 22 he announced his decision precisely to Colonna, who was famously his "very close and intimate friend." [45] "What more could I do in Italy? Preach under suspicion and preach Christ masked in coded language?" he wrote, informing her of the accusations of heresy against him. "I am what Your Ladyship knows me to be, and my doctrine can be learned from those who have heard me. Indeed, I never preached with greater reserve or modesty than this year." Ochino sought to involve the entire Viterbese group in his choice, almost apologizing for the embarrassment he would inevitably cause. He added that "it would have been exceedingly welcome to me to speak with you and obtain your judgment and that of the Most Reverend Monsignor Pole, or a letter from you; but it is more than a month since I have received your letters." [46] Giberti's irritation and embarrassment are therefore understandable. On August 28 he wrote to Ercole Gonzaga deploring "the madness or imprudence of one who without cause has disturbed the whole world." For his part, he concluded that one must always remain on "those paths that are loyal: to speak privately, write, admonish, weep, and pray privately." [47] Vermigli too appealed to Pole at that time, [48] while at the beginning of December the marchioness, seeking to avert suspicion from the Ecclesia viterbiensis, [49] and following the English cardinal's advice with the evident aim of showing her willingness to cooperate, sent Cervini a letter and a booklet that Ochino had delivered to her, although by then he was safely in Geneva. "I am greatly grieved that the more he thinks to excuse himself, the more he accuses himself," she added in a postscript to the covering letter, "and the more he believes he is saving others from shipwreck, the more he exposes them to the flood, being himself outside the ark that saves and secures." [50] Shortly afterward, in 1543, Rinaldo Corso's commentary on the marchioness of Pescara's Spiritual Rhymes appeared at Bologna. Despite the sensational affair of the previous year, it still mentioned "the most devout father Fra Bernardino of Siena [...], of whom she shows herself no less a disciple than Magdalene once was of Christ." [51]

Colonna would die in Rome in 1547, remaining until the end at the center of a dense network of heterodox associations and friendships, and visited until the end by Michelangelo. He was deeply devoted to her and owed her, at least in part, the religious turning point that from the early 1540s also marked his artistic production. [52] Writing to him from Viterbo, the marchioness reminded him of her continual prayers to "that Lord of whom you spoke to me with so ardent and humble a heart when I departed from Rome." [53] Vasari would recall the intense exchange of spiritual sonnets between Buonarroti, "in love" with the noblewoman's virtues, "as she likewise was with his," [54] while in his Life of the great Tuscan artist Ascanio Condivi would write that "after her death he remained many times bewildered and as though deprived of his senses." [55]

2. "Inner Struggles" and "Consolation"

It was immediately after Ochino's flight and on the eve of the council's opening, in November 1542, that Colonna's correspondence with Morone began. In the future he would try to minimize his relations with the Roman noblewoman, emphasizing that her husband had been "the ruin" of his father in Milan. He would say that his conversations with the marchioness almost always concerned "affairs of state," in which "she professed great expertise," to such an extent that it led people to believe Pope Farnese consulted her about the choice of his successor. [56] He would admit that he knew of her friendship with the Sienese Capuchin - "and I suspect that she had also shared some of his opinions" - and above all of her filial devotion to Pole. [57]

The surviving letters Colonna addressed to him instead reveal the foundations of their "familiarity and conversation," [58] as Carnesecchi would call it. It rested upon a very similar religious experience, not only in doctrinal content but in its very nature as conversion and spiritual illumination: an experience that had turned them away from false "superstition," shown them the path of true faith, [59] and inaugurated a "service [...] founded upon a great foundation and [...] placed in a lofty place." [60] Hence the centrality of the English cardinal, "divine Pole, | who walks above the stars, lofty and alone," [61] and the common veneration for him

that emerges from the correspondence between the Milanese cardinal and the Roman poet. Its spiritual content filters through language that is allusive, cryptic, and sometimes even ciphered, capable of reproducing the forms of that "spiritual conversation" in which Morone was then being involved at Trent. It must also be remembered that all these letters, later seized by the inquisitors among the Milanese cardinal's private papers and used against him during the trial, were attached to the prosecution dossier as evidence of his heretical deviations. They seemed to show that he too had been a disciple "in new doctrine" of the English cardinal, as Colonna had shortly before; that she was closely bound to Morone through the false doctrines they shared; and indeed that she was his accomplice under Pole's guidance, making Pole both the master and accomplice of them both. [62]

Already on November 30, 1542, the day after the Milanese cardinal's arrival at Trent, Colonna wrote to thank him for what he had recently promised her at Viterbo "with so much Christian affection": namely, that he would protect Pole.
She also wished to express all her "consolation" at the "great union in the bond of true peace" and "divine charity" that now joined the two "dear friends," at the moment when God had willed "that together they should share His most ample treasures and inestimable riches" and had "chosen them for so great and important a purpose," giving them "excellent inspirations." An evident reference to their common religious experience was her description of Pole as an "instrument" of Christ, in whom Colonna could "see and feel at every moment" her own soul, illuminated - as Morone's now was - by the "very great truths that God has placed in his heart." The punctilious compiler of the Compendium of the Morone trial would infer from these words that the Milanese cardinal was plainly the accomplice of Colonna and Pole, as well as the latter's disciple "in new doctrine," and that he maintained with them an intense friendship that was "intimate, secret, spiritual, and familiar." [63]

Less than a month later, on December 22, the marchioness returned to the theme of "consolation," rejoicing at what Pole had written to her about the Milanese cardinal. Far from being "sparing with the graces and lights that God has given him," Morone's "blessed spirit" had immediately shown itself "so humble and receptive [...] that it does not let the smallest drop of the living water given to it fall, but without altering it in the least sends it back to the first fountain from which monsignor receives it," namely Christ. With this water, fertile in truth and faith, the two men, "being satisfied together," were preparing to irrigate "His now all too barren vineyard," the whole Church, "although Your Lordship in humility appears for the moment almost to despair of this." By that date Colonna could therefore evoke her spiritual rebirth under Pole's guidance, whose "infallible rule" led her "along the straight path," certain that Morone understood the meaning of her words. They revealed the cardinal's "humble acceptance" of a religious message that was newly shaping his sensibility and attitudes and leading him to regard Pole with the same eyes as Colonna: as the Christ whose "spirit" she felt "absolutely in his words, his manner, and his every action." [64]

Informed by Morone that Pole had given him some of his writings, the marchioness urged him to read them again for his "consolation," "because the first seems to me that strong water which consumes all corrupt flesh, while the second is that most gentle ointment which refreshes and comforts." [65] Further "consolation" came to the marchioness from the cardinal's next letter, in which he wrote that he understood how her affection, gratitude, and veneration for the English cardinal sprang from a "truly good spirit," and declared that he now shared them with equal intensity. [66] On May 20, 1543, Colonna returned once more to the harmonious spiritual accord and indissoluble bond that seemed to have formed between Morone and Pole, who had by then left Trent. She declared herself certain that the Milanese cardinal could and should be regarded as "one of those dearest and most elect sons of our common father," capable of feeling and acting even without his master. "And thus I regard Your Most Illustrious Lordship and Monsignor Pole together in one and the same hand; and therefore I do not wonder if, warmed by the same virtue, they never tire of kindling one another." It is not difficult to perceive in the emotions vibrating between the lines of these letters her satisfaction at Morone's co-option among the spirituali. The inquisitors would feel authorized to conclude that the marchioness exalted Pole's and Morone's virtues, common outlook, and mutual love as an allusion to the religious doctrines they shared. [67]

The constant recurrence of the word "consolation" in this correspondence deserves attention. It seems to refer to a knowledge purified of every theological formalism, transformed into trust through abandonment to the "benefit of Christ" and to the spirituality embodied in the famous short treatise published in 1543 "for the consolation and benefit" of all Christians. [68] With a series of direct quotations from the Benefit and from Valdesian texts, Flaminio had set out that spirituality in a letter probably sent to Matteo Dandolo on September 12 of the previous year to comfort him after Contarini's death. In Valdesian fashion he invited Dandolo to renounce "human prudence" and "the eloquence of the world," to turn his gaze toward "that sole consoler of the afflicted," and to feel himself united with Christ, entrusting himself without reserve to the one who alone "can console us in tribulations, moderate us in prosperity, aid us in dangers, converse with us so sweetly, and make us love God so ardently." [69] Colonna wrote similar words at that time to Sister Serafina Contarini, urging her not to surrender to grief but to keep her "inward eye" always fixed upon that "consoling spirit" which "always" dwelt in Pole. [70] The English cardinal had addressed the marchioness of Pescara herself the year before, thanking her for words that had brought him relief at one of the most painful moments of his life, when he had seemed deprived of all human consolation and inwardly prostrate. Yet he attributed the merit to the divine Spirit, the source of every true and lasting consolation. [71] The same concept is central to several undated and unsigned pages in Pole's hand, which Alvise Priuli sent Morone on May 22, 1543, to relieve the "solitude" of which he had complained with the comfort of the English cardinal's words. Pole for his part was ready to console himself "with the consolation that he is certain the Lord God will not fail to give him." [72]

In the first of the two texts, the English cardinal referred to an earlier exchange of letters and justified his new writing by divine inspiration "to say something pleasing to her, idest [that is] to the honor of God or the edification of one's neighbor, because I know that this alone is pleasing to her to read," beyond all "one's own prudence" and "pride." He sought to interpret his friend's "inner struggles" and spiritual "battles" as "signs of mature and vigorous spiritual age." Using arguments and concepts typical of the Valdesian Considerations or of Flaminio's contemporary letters, Pole also tried in the second text to comfort Morone, reminding him "that the spirit which feels its solitude, laments it, prays, and asks companionship and help from God is never left alone, although it appears so." His sense of solitude was in fact nothing other than the expression of the "desire to enjoy that Lord to whom our soul is given as bride," a desire moved "by the Holy Spirit and [...] caused by His presence," which therefore lived and breathed in his friend's soul. He must entrust himself to it, even though "experience" showed that "that blessed Spirit, who implet et illustrat omnia [fills and enlightens all things], [...] sometimes hides Himself," as though sunk in the "abyss of our darkness caused by sin," which can "darken not only the light of the sun but remove from the soul's sight the light of that true light which gave light to the sun and to all creatures and penetrat omnia [penetrates all things]." It must not be forgotten that the two men exchanging these letters were cardinals appointed as legates to the council. Both were fully conscious of the importance of that role, which was linked to the hope for a profound renewal of the Church. The disappointment of that hope now seemed imminent, with the evident failure of the first convocation.

> One thing alone I wish to add, Pole concluded, which causes me a little distress in this solitude of Your Most Reverend Lordship: that the mustard seed we hoped would grow in arborem quae extenderet ramos in quibus aves coeli etc. [into a tree that would spread branches in which the birds of heaven might dwell, etc.] has been reduced from that expected breadth to the sole person of Your Most Reverend Lordship. Yet for this reason I do not wish to despair, because your person does not allow me to do so. It remains only to pray to the sower that He give it such power to grow as may serve your salvation and that of the whole Church, and this I do continually.

Complex spiritual tensions, vivifying religious experiences, political commitment, and painful expectations seem intertwined in these letters. As evidence of the sense of belonging to a group, of "inward kinship," [73] and at times of genuine complicity that coalesced around the spirituali, Priuli immediately communicated them to Colonna. This shared consciousness - also evident in Giulia Gonzaga's correspondence with Pietro Carnesecchi - emerges from the constant recurrence of the word "our." It appears, for example, in the marchioness's reply to Priuli, in which she declared that she had "never seen a

better thing from monsignor than this letter. Blessed be our Most Reverend Morone, whose goodness so greatly arouses the charity of our monsignor," making him capable of "rendering such lofty concepts so clearly intelligible, which by God's grace I certainly seem to understand well." Prompted by Priuli, Colonna returned here to her "excessive affection" for Pole, the "spirit of God," in a difficult passage perhaps somewhat corrupt in the text that has reached us. [74]

> You know that I have experienced everything with you, and the consolations have been silences, prohibitions, separations, and discouragements of every kind - I mean in this matter, because in everything else I have always been all too greatly consoled by you. Thus in the end I conclude from your actions and charity that the matter is so perfect, my affection so just, due, and holy, so useful to my soul, so dear and pleasing to God, that you are only drawing me back, as one draws the mind back from prayer that is too fixed and from the sweetness of the spirit, so that it may return to serve its other neighbors in the exercise of charity; for with monsignor I exercise faith more, receiving absolutely from God whatever he does. Thus I remain forever most indebted to my sweetest and Most Reverend Morone, who consoles me in every way.

The exchange of writings and books attested by these documents is also reflected in the letter Colonna sent Pole on July 15, 1543. The inquisitors would later find it among Morone's papers and draw from it confirmation that the English cardinal held bad opinions "de vocatione et praedestinatione [concerning calling and predestination]." [75] In that letter the marchioness, communicating her "consolation" at his imminent return, thanked him for sending a text that described the soul's path along the way of salvation shown by the cross, in the terms of an arduous earthly journey sustained by trust in "that most wondrous sacrifice" and in "eternal election." [76] In May of the following year Priuli wrote to Morone, then legate in Bologna, promising soon to send him a copy of the twenty gatherings containing the transcription of the already "revised" portion of an unspecified work by Pole. This, he added, "will open the way for the lady marchioness to receive the same grace." [77] Colonna herself told Bartoli, probably toward the end of 1543, that she had received "certain writings [...] from Cardinal Pole, and in particular certain gatherings of a book he was composing de modo concionandi [on the method of preaching]." [78]

The correspondence between Colonna and "sweet" Morone [79] continued in the following years, during the cardinal's Bolognese legation, [80] and the religious themes at the center of the marchioness's experience sounded through it with particular intensity. In the background was her constantly repeated wish that they might "all be together in peace and consolation, sitting and awaiting power from on high, without suffering obstruction from the unbelief around us." Although couched in ciphered language, these letters reflect Morone's religious transformation, and the inquisitors would indeed find in them clear traces "of imbibed doctrine," under the intellectual mastery of Pole, her "Elisha," as the marchioness of Pescara called him in June 1544 while lamenting that she could not see him as often as she wished. [81] At the beginning of May 1545, on the eve of the new convocation of the council that Pole would again be called to preside over, Colonna confided to Morone, her "true and saving comfort," all the bitterness of the solitude oppressing her and her anxiety over the dangers gathering around "this excellent master, our lord," the stern guardian "of his intrepid faith" and a "light of God all the clearer to the inward eye the more it is darkened to the outward." [82] Her solitude was all the more grievous because, as the marchioness herself had written to the Viterbese nuns among whom she had lived until shortly before, "the absence of those who guide us to Him [Christ], who by their examples show us His footprints, by their words His light, and by every effect make the way sweet and easy for us - this alone is all the affliction that can befall a Christian." [83]

Shortly afterward, on May 20-23, writing from Viterbo in reply to two letters from Morone, Colonna addressed him again. He was afflicted by many "impediments, troubles, and labors contrary to the peace his spirit desires," and she once more insisted on the theme of "consolation" and the teaching of Pole, the "perfect instrument" in whom "the voice of the Lord" rang clearly, almost a new "Christ sent by God to unite the Jewish people with the Gentile." It is less easy to understand what Colonna meant when she wrote that she seemed "to hear him with his Christian humility lower that mountain and with his truth show that cross the true inward cross in bearing with one's brother." [84] These words testify to the providential expectations with which the spirituali regarded the Council of Trent, their tenacious hopes that the religious rupture of Europe might be healed there, and their illusions regarding the role Pole might assume. [85] Yet they were also

ambiguous and elusive expressions that inevitably aroused inquisitorial suspicion. The inquisitors sought to learn from Morone himself what hidden allusion lay within them, perhaps suspecting that "lowering that mountain" and "showing that cross the true inward cross" concealed some cryptic reference to the devaluation of works and justification by faith alone. The cardinal's answer sounded almost mocking: taking advantage of the texts' polysemy, he attributed to Colonna only the intention of "ingeniously" alluding to the other two papal legates to the council, Giovanni Maria Del Monte and Marcello Cervini, cardinal of Santa Croce. [86] In reality it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to establish the authentic meaning of those words. They probably concealed more than one meaning and therefore permitted different readings within the folds of a ciphered language, to the point that the tribunal abandoned further questioning of the cardinal about these elusive writings, impenetrable to the uninitiated.

Especially significant is the last letter in this group, addressed to Morone in November 1546, when Pole had already withdrawn from Trent and all hope that the council would approve a different decree on justification had vanished. Wishing that God might grant him "every spiritual consolation," the marchioness begged him not to answer, "for it is already too great a grace for me to see what he writes to our Messer Luigi [Priuli], who has not returned as healthy as I would wish." These words referred not to the Venetian patrician's physical health but to his spiritual condition. He too was evidently dissatisfied, no less than his patron, with the direction taken by the conciliar discussions of justification, which foreshadowed a decree affirming the meritorious value of works. The cryptic statement that "excessive satisfaction is consuming him" seems to allude to this, as does the wish that he "might go for a while to stay where Your Lordship has been," namely Germany, "and be obliged to speak in a Pelagian manner." [87] It is unsurprising that the inquisitors also asked Morone a precise question about this letter, seeking to understand the meaning of those obscure words, [88] and that he was once again ready with an evasive answer. [89]

Soon afterward, on February 25, 1547, Colonna died, naming Pole, Morone, and Sadoleto as the executors of her will. [90] The already cited memorial of Giovan Battista Scotti indicates that in her last years the marchioness maintained contacts and ties with numerous exponents of heretical dissent even in Rome, and that much could have been said about her by "the nuns of the convents where she stayed in several cities such as Rome, Viterbo, and Florence, since she tried to persuade some of those nuns of Lutheran things," urging them "to abandon the invocation of the Virgin and the saints." Scotti's charges were all the more substantial because from the first moment, knowing "that he was one of the brethren, [Colonna] revealed herself freely to him as a Lutheran, showing that she regarded the Catholics of the Roman Church as blind and ignorant, as people who did not properly understand justification with all its consequences concerning works, merits, and predestination." In speaking with him she had made no secret of possessing and reading Lutheran books or of her disbelief that in "auricular confession remission of sins was truly conferred through the power of the keys; rather, as soon as the sinner repented and believed in Christ, he was justified by that righteousness of Christ imputed to him." In Valdesian fashion she declared that "to say that it was necessary to receive absolution through the authority of the keys seemed to her to disturb her peace of conscience." [91]

The extremely close bond with Pole on which Scotti insisted would also be confirmed in testimony against Morone by a Burgundian Dominican, according to whom the English cardinal used his own money and received funds from Colonna to use in proselytizing and supporting heterodox groups throughout Italy, just as Renée of France did, she being "suspected of heresy" and, like Colonna, a "financier of heretics." It was precisely for this reason, moreover, that the marchioness of Pescara "lived alone in convents," according to the inference the perpetually suspicious compiler of the compendium of Morone's trial felt entitled to draw. [92] Although no formal trial for heresy was ever opened against her, [93] the malicious but not arbitrary interpretations the inquisitors placed upon her letters attest their judgment of her religious opinions. That judgment remained both severe and enduring even decades after the marchioness's death. An unknown official of the tribunal then returned to a group of her letters to Pole, delivered to Rome in 1568, and continued to detect in them the seeds of dangerous spiritualist heresies - "she seems to approach the Poor of Lyon" - and above all of Reformed doctrines concerning sola fide and the certainty of grace, with all the consequences that could be

drawn for purgatory, the veneration of saints, and the authority of the Church. [94] A few years later, on the basis of these premises and of the documentation in its possession, the Holy Office had not the slightest doubt about Colonna's heresy, as appears from a document attached to Morone's inquisitorial dossier. [95]

> That the marchioness of Pescara was a heretic is shown, besides the depositions formerly made before the Holy Office and letters and writings full of suspicion and bad phrasing and perhaps even, in the opinion of some, of heresy, as well as her close association, conversation, and friendship with many heretics and suspects, by the clear testimony of several persons in the time of our lord Pius V, and expressly by Guido da Fano and Carnesecchi, although the latter seeks with all his power to excuse her, just as he likewise does all his friends.

All this must be taken into account in order to understand the Roman noblewoman's religious experience among the spirituali. One must avoid the sterile problem of defining her in terms of compatibility or incompatibility with Catholic orthodoxy, but also avoid remaining imprisoned within the fixed and stereotyped image - already widely current among contemporaries and later preserved by a long historiographical tradition - of the devout poet, the chaste widow always immersed in "divine thoughts," far removed from the world and from the religious conflicts tearing it apart.

3. "The Foremost Men in Italy [...] Held Their Opinions"

It may certainly seem surprising that this solid Lombard prelate, always with his feet on the ground, capable of devising projects and strategies on a vast scale, fresh from demanding diplomatic missions in which he had skillfully steered papal policy through the stormy German sea and held his own against Charles V and Ferdinand I, Granvelle and Aleandro, should have been so suddenly seduced by Valdesian spiritualism, by its wholly inward faith, by the attention it gave to the beating of the heart and the expectation of the Spirit's illumination. Nothing, apparently, could have been further from Morone's disenchanted pragmatism, his political lucidity, and his concrete decisiveness in confronting problems. Yet the documents speak clearly, and since the mysteries of the soul cannot be sounded, one can only advance a few hypotheses.

There can be no doubt that Pole's charismatic personality played a decisive role in opening unexpected religious horizons before his younger colleague. After Contarini's death, many of those who had previously identified with his irenic positions gathered under the English cardinal's leadership precisely as he was directing his choices toward Valdesianism. It must also be considered that the Tridentine legation imposed new tasks upon Morone, tasks requiring theological competence, as he had begun to perceive during his nunciatures and especially through his encounter with Contarini at Regensburg. There he had understood that political sagacity was insufficient to confront problems dividing European Christianity over the nature of faith and the means of attaining eternal salvation. [96] This is also attested by the books seized from his study at the time of his arrest on May 31, 1557. They included not only Flaminio's Paraphrasis in Psalmos, Colonna's Spiritual Rhymes, and Fregoso's Treatise on Prayer, but also a substantial collection of Protestant Bibles; Cornelius Agrippa's De vanitate scientiarum; Johannes Carion's Chronica; Urbanus Rhegius's Medicine of the Soul; numerous works by Erasmus, including the Greek edition of the New Testament, the Adagia, the Modus orandi Deum, the Apophtegmata, and the Colloquia; as well as manuscripts on highly delicate subjects, such as De votis monasticis, perhaps Luther's short treatise of that title, De potestate praelatorum, De materia iustificationis, and De vocandis haereticis ad concilium. [97] It was Morone's most trusted collaborator, Filippo Gheri, formerly a member of Contarini's household, [98] who wrote to Bologna at that time to purchase Sebastian Münster's Bible and later the epistles published by Robert Estienne. [99]

It was diplomatic service itself, in short, that had taught Morone that religion, even in its difficult doctrinal dimension, was an indispensable instrument of politics. One could not hope to reform the Church and reconstruct the unity of the respublica christiana without reckoning with the bitter theological controversies dividing it, perhaps in order to weaken and transcend them in the manner Valdés had taught. Now, called to lead a council demanded for twenty years and repeatedly postponed, Morone could not avoid confronting these new tasks with knowledge and responsibility, since it would fall to him to direct the debates at Trent. For this reason he turned to the teaching of Pole and Flaminio, who were delighted to win

so valuable an ally should the assembly succeed in beginning its work. This did not happen, however, and when his colleague withdrew from Trent the Milanese cardinal was soon left alone to ponder the doctrines that had so intensely involved him, not least with a view to his pastoral duties at Modena, as we shall see. [100] In the future the inquisitors would call these doctrines the disciplina Poli, offering an entirely arbitrary, not to say caricatural, summary that is nevertheless useful for understanding their obsessions concerning the spirituali. [101]

> Departure from the true faith. Conversations and discussions concerning heresies. Disputes concerning the new doctrine. Pressure upon preachers to preach heresies. Dispatch of preachers. [...] Discussion of heretical questions with various persons. Choice of a Catholic preacher. Favor shown to heretics and their defense. Gifts and subsidies knowingly given to heretics. Reading of heretical books with subversive intentions. Exchange of heretical books. Keeping heretical familiars and books in one's household. Negligence in punishing heretics. Dissimulation in repressing them even after being warned. Assertion that heretics should be tolerated. Manifestation of joy among the Modenese heretics. Suspicion aroused in authoritative persons. Most evil reputation among Catholics and heretics.

It was therefore the imminence of the council under Pole's presidency that led the small Viterbese community to emerge from the prudent channels of private conversation, epistolary exchange, and manuscript circulation within which it had previously remained, and to seek a political strategy in the new situation created by the Tridentine convocation. In those years, despite the flights of Ochino and Vermigli and despite the establishment of the Roman Holy Office, immediately ready to surround the English cardinal's "school" with suspicions and spies, some of the most prestigious members of the Sacred College regarded those doctrines with curiosity and interest and were at times drawn into them. This continued until the approval of the Tridentine decree on justification and beyond. They included not only Pole and Morone, but also passionate readers of The Benefit of Christ such as Cardinals Tommaso Badia and Cristoforo Madruzzo, who kept it beside him "in delitiis, bound in gold," and Gregorio Cortese, who, although a member of the tribunal of the Holy Office, said that every morning when he put on his doublet he did not know how to clothe himself "in anything other than this benefit of Christ." [102]

For Pietro Bembo, his encounter with Ochino in 1539, precisely when Paul III was calling him into the Sacred College, inaugurated a new religious sensibility. It led him not only to side with Contarini during the Diet of Regensburg but also to work for the convocation of the council, personally preach the Gospel in his remote diocese of Gubbio, protect Vittore Soranzo - whom he designated as his successor to the episcopal see of Bergamo - and finally die in the certainty that faith alone would save him. [103] Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga of Mantua cannot properly be numbered among the spirituali, but he was extremely open to the new doctrines, not least because of his constant political conflict with Paul III. He was always attentive to new books from beyond the Alps, ready to protect persons suspected of heresy such as Pier Paolo Vergerio, listen to suspect preachers, and surround himself with a court teeming with heterodox figures. Among them was his own secretary Endimio Calandra, later tried and condemned in 1568, according to whom Mantua had seen "an uninterrupted succession of preachers who always preached bad doctrine, some a little more concealed and some more openly." [104] In 1545 Calandra himself attacked the "crooked necks who, under the appearance of holiness, revel splendidly, [...] more severe than Cato against Catiline," but concluded that "now is a time when everyone has come out of tutelage [...] and by now everyone understands Saint Paul." [105] So too did the Dominican Pietro Bertano, who had formerly read and commented on Saint Paul's epistles for Gonzaga and whom Julius III would raise to the cardinalate, although in the inquisitors' judgment he was nothing less than a Lutheran, to be numbered among "those who held the matter of justification," as Calandra would later say. [106] Cardinal Federico Fregoso, although coming from different experiences - a long French exile during which he had adhered to the evangelical movement of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples and Marguerite of Navarre - would shortly before his death in 1541 ultimately arrive at religious conclusions very similar to Pole's. [107]

Alongside those illustrious cardinals can be placed many bishops and archbishops: Giovanni Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, subjected to grave suspicions of heresy that prevented his entry into the Sacred College; Girolamo Seripando, general of the Augustinians; Pier Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capodistria; his brother Giovan Battista, bishop of Pola; Vittore Soranzo of Bergamo; Giovan Francesco Verdura of Treviso;

Iacopo Nacchianti of Chioggia; Nicola Maria Caracciolo of Catania; Nicola Francesco Missanelli of Policastro; and another dozen Neapolitan prelates, including the powerful Pietro Antonio Di Capua, archbishop of Otranto and brother-in-law of Don Ferrante Gonzaga. [108] Hence the fear still expressed by the Holy Office in 1554 concerning the many cardinals in whom it believed one could identify an actual heretical conventicle, equipped with a dense network of relations with figures of the highest social rank. As had already occurred in Spanish alumbradismo during the 1520s and 1530s, [109] these included numerous noblewomen - Vittoria Colonna, Giulia Gonzaga, Caterina Cibo, Eleonora Gonzaga, and Renée of France herself - powerful aristocrats and Neapolitan barons such as Ferrante Sanseverino, Consalvo Bernaudo, Ferrante Brancaccio, Mario Galeota, and Giovan Francesco Alois; Roman nobles such as Ascanio Colonna and Camillo Orsini; Venetian patricians; members of the Medici court and Florentine culture; and famous preachers. Morone's "seduction" at Trent, for example, ran parallel to that of Galeazzo Caracciolo, marquis of Vico, to whom at the beginning of 1543 Flaminio wrote, also on Pole's behalf, to express satisfaction at his "holy calling," of which he had been informed by several Neapolitan Valdesians. [110] In Venice at the beginning of the 1550s Carnesecchi made no secret to Calandra that their heterodox "opinions" had been, and still were, shared by many "learned and great men," indeed by "the foremost [...] men in Italy." [111]

An entire generation was therefore involved in those doctrines: not only ordinary people, notaries, schoolmasters, merchants, artisans, and women, but also famous men of letters and the powerful of the earth, princes and cardinals, affected in different ways by Valdesian spirituality and, to a greater or lesser degree, overwhelmed by its sudden decline. That decline was caused both by its theological and political fragility and by the disruptive action of the Holy Office, which from the very beginning made it its principal target. [112] It would naturally be absurd to adopt the inquisitorial simplification that branded the spirituali as nothing more than a "sect of Lutherans." [113] Yet it would be no less distorting to ignore that support and retrospectively deny all credibility to the admittedly unrealistic religious prospects promoted by the Ecclesia viterbiensis, including in the political and pastoral sphere. Beyond the most radical core of those doctrines and the complex mediations they allowed between inward convictions and the authority of the Church, they appeared in the specific Italian context under the auspices of highly authoritative figures capable of offering not only protection and complicity but, above all, ecclesiastical and social legitimation. To this must be added the fact that the religious orientations of the spirituali, like those of Alfonso and Juan de Valdés before them, served the needs of religious agreement and the reconstruction of the respublica christiana at the center of Habsburg policy and were therefore linked in various ways to the Imperial Italy studied by Elena Bonora. [114] It was precisely the pro-Habsburg party that assumed a decisive role after the end of the Medici papacies and the election of Paul III, when the Holy See finally gave some sign of wishing to react to the Protestant Reformation and the collapse of European religious unity.

The failure to implement the measures proposed in 1537 by the Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia soon made it clear that Pope Farnese in reality intended more to appear than to be a reforming pontiff. Already in 1538, when Vittoria Colonna asked why every initiative for renewal had ultimately run aground, Pole and Contarini reportedly answered her with a shrug, "wishing rather by silence - to her, who had intelligence - than by openly stating the cause to give her their answer," [115] plainly alluding to the pope's lack of genuine political will. In September 1537, moreover, a fierce anti-Farnese figure such as Giovangirolamo de' Rossi, bishop of Pavia, wrote to Cardinal Gonzaga that Paul III always took care to give the "reformers" something to do, involving them in some chimerical project of curial renewal, "because when they remain idle they grumble like cloistered friars." He let them write some fine document, while in the meantime "things continue in the customary fashion, and they laugh at these simpletons who believe what he says." [116] A few months later Cardinal Benedetto Accolti of Ravenna, another sworn enemy of the pontiff, informed Gonzaga that the opponents of every reform had by then prevailed, because to admit its necessity meant "turning upside down everything done since Saint Peter" and conceding that the Lutherans were right: if things were changed, "it was surely a sign that they had been wicked." [117]

And yet, despite the cunning, ambiguity, ulterior motives, and nepotistic ambitions of papal policy, for about a decade men such as Contarini and Bembo, Pole and Morone, played a leading role at the summit of

the Church. This was possible partly because they formed the core of a group capable for a time of presenting itself on the political stage as united, cemented by common religious orientations and common objectives of reforming the Church and restoring European religious unity, which entailed objective convergences with imperial policy. Contarini, also because of pressure from Charles V, was chosen as the legate to be sent to Germany to seek agreement with the Protestants in the religious colloquies; Morone secured consensus on the location of the council and masterfully directed the Church's policy in the German world, aided by the esteem he won from Ferdinand I. Both Pole and Morone were called to preside over Trent in the 1540s, and it is worth observing that throughout the council's long history they alone received that appointment twice. Both were also the Habsburg sovereigns' candidates in the conclaves of the 1540s and 1550s, although the strenuous opposition of the intransigents - now able to use the efficient institutional instrument of the Holy Office against them - always succeeded in preventing their election.

It is of course unsurprising to find in the pro-imperial camp German and Spanish cardinals or members of great Italian families such as the Colonna, Gonzaga, and Pio da Carpi, which, although divided by bitter rivalries, had long been tied to the chariot of Habsburg policy. In many cases, however, that chariot was then also acquiring a religious character through choices not aligned with Roman orthodoxy. [118] Consider, for example, Vittoria Colonna's brother Ascanio, the sworn enemy of Paul III, against whom he rebelled in 1541 during the

The so-called “Salt War,” which broke out in the midst of the Regensburg colloquies. 119 The Dominican (and future inquisitor) Matteo Lachi argued bitterly with him, trying in vain to dissuade him from the conviction “that faith was a gift of God, that is, the act of believing, and that this act of belief was produced neither by the soul nor by any power of it, but was caused by God alone within us.” His interlocutor did not hesitate to answer him violently on the subject of indulgences, openly declaring that “he could not accept that the merits of any creature, save those of Christ, could make satisfaction for the penalties due to our sins.” When questioned by the inquisitors during Morone’s trial, Lachi would say that he believed the heretical poison had first been instilled in him by Ochino, with whom he had enjoyed “great familiarity,” and then by Pole, who had become “one and the same thing” with his sister Vittoria; by Fregoso, to whom he was “deeply attached”; and by the deposed duchess of Camerino, Caterina Cibo, “rotten with Lutheranism” and likewise close to Ochino, who in her Florentine house “took off the Capuchin habit when he left Italy and went to Geneva.” In May 1542, speaking also on behalf of his sister, Colonna intervened in favor of the great Sienese preacher, defending him from the suspicions and accusations of the malicious, who had “counted his words in the pulpit at Naples one by one in order to catch him out”; 120 shortly afterward, he would use every means to cover his flight. Although Lachi regarded him as a dangerous heretic, in the early 1540s he had nevertheless refrained from denouncing the Roman baron to the Holy Office, knowing full well that “because of the favor enjoyed by such men in the world, it did not seem possible to punish these great lords in this way.” 121 In 1568 Endimio Calandra would tell the inquisitors that Colonna “always had his house full […] of men in disguise, who were defrocked friars, […] and was forever sending messengers back and forth to Fra Bernardino”; that he regularly supplied him with money, read works by Melanchthon and Brenz, publicly called anyone who preached otherwise a madman, sheltered heterodox figures of every kind in his home, and “held all the opinions held by Fra Bernardino Ochino,” in whom he believed “as in Christ,” while nevertheless always “defending the authority of the pope.” 122

The case of Cosimo de’ Medici is particularly significant. A loyal adherent of Charles V, on whom his very throne depended, his bitter conflict with Paul III reached boiling point on more than one occasion: the duke of Florence was ready to recruit Schmalkaldic troops to guard the borders with the Papal States, while the enraged pontiff went so far as to initiate a heresy trial against him. Poisoned also by the continual exaction of tithes, the clash finally erupted in 1545, when Cosimo resolved to expel the Piagnoni friars from San Marco, a stronghold of republican opposition, provoking a furious papal reaction that ultimately forced him to rescind the measure. Religious views at variance with Catholic orthodoxy were also held at the time by numerous government officials and trusted servants of the duke - certainly not without his knowledge - including Bartolomeo Panciatichi, Alessandro Del Caccia, Pier Francesco Riccio, Lelio Torelli, and the bishop of Cortona, Giovan Battista Ricasoli; for more than twenty years, moreover, Carnesecchi was able to rely on Cosimo’s protection.

It was then that the duke commissioned Iacopo Pontormo to translate Juan de Valdés’s newly printed catechism for children into images, making it the guiding thread of the grand frescoes in the choir of the basilica of San Lorenzo, the Medici church par excellence. The great artist would work on them for more than a decade, and Bronzino would complete them in 1558. 123 A similar religious message was entrusted at the time to the no less magnificent marble choir of the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore, carved by Baccio Bandinelli. 124 The Florentine Academy, the vibrant center of the city’s culture in the duke’s service, teemed with heterodox thinkers and enthusiastic readers of *The Benefit of Christ*: Benedetto Varchi, Cosimo Bartoli, Giambattista Gelli, Pier Francesco Giambullari, Bronzino himself, and many others. They were joined by outsiders such as Cornelio Donzellino, Anton Francesco Doni, and Ludovico Domenichi, who translated and arranged the publication there of Calvin’s *Excuse à messieurs les nicodémites*.

No firm religious convictions can, of course, be discerned at the root of these tendencies in Cosimo’s policy. At least in these years, such convictions were far removed from a new prince such as he, who stood much closer to Machiavelli than to Luther. His course was inspired instead by essentially political considerations, above all the violent conflict with Paul III, who regarded nearby Siena as a possible morsel for his nepotistic appetite and disliked the presence of Charles V’s soldiers on the borders of the Papal States.

The young duke of Florence, for his part, had many reasons to detest Pope Farnese, who gave shelter in Rome to every Florentine exile and bestowed the red hat on members of the great anti-Medici families, including the Ridolfi, the Gaddi, and the Salviati. He even appointed Antonio Altoviti, son of Bindo, the wealthy banker who financed every republican initiative, as archbishop of the city. In response, Cosimo barred the prelate from setting foot in Florence for twenty years; the city, conversely, became a refuge for all the pope's enemies, from Cardinal Benedetto Accolti to the deposed duchess of Camerino, Caterina Cibo.

If Charles V's principal objective had been, and remained, the pacification of European *christianitas*, whether through religious colloquies or through a council that would seriously address the many evils afflicting the ecclesiastical institution, there is no doubt that the pontiff did everything possible to prevent an agreement with the Protestants, in which he saw only the prelude to renewed imperial power, and to induce the council to deal harshly with the Lutherans while going lightly on the reform of the Church. All this helps explain why the *spirituali* were so closely bound to Habsburg policy, although Pole and Morone continued to receive prestigious appointments in the service of Pope Farnese. The pope was certainly not unaware of their political orientation, but was reassured by the knowledge that they had no intention of interfering with his family strategies. 125

It is in this context that the efforts of the Viterbese *spirituali* to spread Valdesian doctrines must be assessed, chiefly through *The Benefit of Christ*. Flaminio worked intensely on its final revision - already begun earlier 126 - in the summer of 1542, doubtless with the intention of publishing it for the first convocation of the Council of Trent, which was to open under the presidency of Pole and Morone. By then the *Christian Alphabet* was also ready for the press and would have been sent to the printer had Ochino's flight - he was explicitly mentioned in the original version 127 - and the creation of the Holy Office not suggested that publication be postponed. *The Benefit* therefore appeared in Venice in 1543 and was reissued in 1546, on the eve of the renewed gathering of the episcopal assembly, at which the English cardinal would again serve as a papal legate.

The enormous success of the little book - according to Vergerio, as many as 40,000 copies were printed in Venice alone during the 1540s 128 - surely encouraged the publication in 1545 of two works by the Spanish exile, both intended for the initiation of disciples: the *Christian Alphabet* and the catechism *The Manner to Be Followed in Instructing the Children of Christians in the Things of Religion from Their Earliest Years*. Also printed was the anthology of Valdesian and Flaminian writings *The Method to Be Followed in Teaching and Preaching the First Principles of the Christian Religion*, followed in 1548 by the *Meditations and Prayers Formed upon Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, delivered by the humanist of Serravalle at Viterbo in 1542. 129 All these books, except the last, were condemned in the first Venetian Index of 1549. 130 The interval during which they could circulate freely was therefore extremely brief, even though they were protected by prudent anonymity and by the absence of anti-papal polemic. They appeared against the background of the conciliar convocations of 1542-45, with the commitment those gatherings elicited and the hopes they authorized. In this sense, these small books, and above all *The Benefit of Christ*, may be regarded as a kind of programmatic manifesto of the *spirituali*: they sought to offer a way out of the religious anxieties widespread at every level of society, to guide the conciliar debates toward outcomes that would avert a dangerous Protestant drift among the heterodox ferment springing up everywhere, and to suggest a possible mediation capable of healing the fracture of Christendom within the framework of a renewed Church.

Those books also formed part of the veritable flood of heterodox texts of the most varied doctrinal coloring that poured from Venetian presses in those years. 131 Some may reasonably be supposed to have been promoted more or less directly by the *spirituali*: for example, the translation of Celio Secondo Curione's *Pasquino in Ecstasy*, made at that time by a Florentine priest in Carnesecchi's Venetian residence; 132 Cardinal Fregoso's *Pious and Most Christian Treatise on Prayer*, published posthumously in Venice in 1542, 1543, and 1546; 133 and, in 1545, also in Venice, the translation of a work by Luther published under Fregoso's name. 134

4. The Failure of the Tridentine Convocation

The experience of conversion that Morone underwent at Trent under the guidance of Pole and Flaminio could not be exhausted in the "spiritual conversation" nourished by edifying readings, conversations, and exchanges of letters, or in the introspection of the increasingly "mature and robust spiritual age" that Pole soon discerned in him. 135 For a man of action such as the Milanese cardinal, that new religious identity had to affect his way of acting, be transformed into operational energy, and give new life to his pastoral and political initiatives. And so it did, with an immediacy that once again reflects the speed of that doctrinal transformation and its need to manifest itself in decisions and conduct. 136

The conciliar legation, moreover, placed few demands on Morone, since the renewal of the Franco-Spanish conflict, Protestant hostility, and the winter climate hindered the arrival of bishops. "No one has appeared here so far," the commissioner general wrote on November 30; shortly afterward Priuli echoed him in telling Beccadelli that there was not even any talk of the council "from any quarter." 137 The legates' letters urging Rome to promote a greater attendance met with little success. 138 In Modena, by contrast, Lancillotti remained optimistic, noting on February 23 that the assembly was growing fuller every day and that "the Lutherans are well disposed to come." 139

Meanwhile, on January 10, 1543, in a long conversation with Morone at Trent while traveling toward Genoa to receive Charles V, Granvelle once again impressed upon him the gravity of the German situation, the need for radical measures of reform, and the widespread distrust that the pontiff intended to enact them - if not in Germany, then at least in Rome, where the "dispensations of the Penitentiary" granted to "abominable and utterly sordid" men were a scandal. Otherwise it was difficult to believe that he truly intended to begin the work of the Tridentine assembly, "since everyone found it strange that the court, in such a state of deformation, should present itself before the council." 140 Toward the end of February Pole began to suffer from ill health, and in mid-April he withdrew for a time to Priuli's villa at Treville near Treviso. He returned briefly to Trent, but left it permanently around mid-May, as did Parisio, to join the pope at Bologna, where Paul III would meet Charles V at Busseto in June. 141 From then on Morone alone held the field, after seven months of fruitless waiting and with prospects increasingly uncertain, amid severe tension between pope and emperor over the failure of the Tridentine assembly and the threat of a German national synod.

Nearly all the few bishops present believed that nothing could be done except transfer the council to a less inconvenient and less dangerous location, Morone wrote on June 30. He agreed with Di Capua and Granvelle, with whom he had held another lengthy conversation at the end of May, 142 that the convocation should be kept in force so as not to lend credence to Protestant accusations that Rome was responsible for its failure. If the pope instead chose suspension *sine die*, the bull should make "express mention of the entire course of the council up to the present day," emphasizing everything he had done to overcome insurmountable obstacles such as "wars among Christians and the dangers posed by the Turk on every side," as well as the seven months of waiting during which very few bishops had reached Trent. It should also promise to reconvene the council at the earliest opportunity "in a place convenient to all nations and especially to Germany." In the meantime, immediately after the suspension, it was necessary "to carry out a most Christian, careful, and general reform in all the places where His Holiness could be obeyed, and to put it into execution," the cardinal advised. He knew that this would not suffice to avert "the danger of Germany's ruin - indeed, Germany may almost be regarded as ruined," and was ever more convinced that "when Germany has fallen completely […] all the rest of Christendom will be in manifest danger." 143

Although immobilized at Trent, Morone thus remained the most authoritative point of reference for the Holy See's German policy. This is also shown by the letter Alessandro Farnese addressed to him on February 20, 1543, when sending Baron Otto Truchsess, the future cardinal, to the Diet of Nuremberg: he relied on Morone's "prudent judgment" to inform the envoy of everything he thought useful, so that "he may conduct himself on this journey according to your recommendations." 144

There is no doubt that the convergence of views between Morone and Di Capua also arose from their shared pro-imperial inclinations. Yet it is reasonable to suppose that after the departure of Pole and Flaminio the Milanese cardinal found in Di Capua - a Valdesian and a “very close friend” of the English cardinal 145 - a privileged interlocutor on religious matters as well. It was probably then, in the first months of 1543, that Priuli or Flaminio gave Di Capua a “writing” by Pole that he immediately took from Morone before the latter had time to read it, as Morone would be careful to stress, vaguely recalling that “perhaps there might have been something in it.” 146 Traces of Morone’s initiation into the doctrines of the *spirituali* also appear at the conclusion of the purely political memorial of June 30, though it was written with intense emotional involvement in what seemed the imminent collapse of German Catholicism. “I should like this to happen without any fault of mine or suspicion of fault,” he wrote, allowing an evident reflection of his new religious identity to emerge in the unprecedented Valdesian language that flowed from his pen: 147

But because events depend upon outcomes, and the reasons on every side are so numerous that human prudence loses its way and only the Spirit of God could strike the mark and reach the point, God should be implored most earnestly to inspire His Holiness and that sacred college to make a good decision, for I believe that never at any time has there been a matter of greater importance.

Two days later, on July 2, he met Charles V for the last time. The emperor was on his way to the Diet of Speyer in great “distress,” not only because of the increasingly bitter German situation but also because of “the little help given him by everyone,” and especially by the pontiff, whom he blamed for causing the council to fail yet again. “The whole court here, as various people report to me, has spoken and continues to speak ill of Our Lord and of the entire Apostolic See, and especially these great lords of Spain,” Morone reported to Rome two days later. 148 In accordance with the opinion expressed by the majority of the bishops present at Trent, the council was finally suspended by the bull *Etsi cunctis* of July 6, 1543. It was not published until September 19, but Morone was notified at once and authorized to leave Trent. 149 “I could no longer bear to remain here,” he wrote on July 26 as he prepared to return to Modena, where he arrived on August 17. He assured Alessandro Farnese that as soon as the great heat abated he would set out for the Curia, as he did at the end of September. 150

During those months of enforced inactivity the bishop of Modena was able, though from a distance, to attend to the government of his diocese. Confirmation is provided by Canon Bonifacio Valentini’s reply to a lost letter Morone had sent him, perhaps before the end of the year, warning him to stop using his home as a gambling den in which scandalous “gaming” took place. 151 Before long, as Sigibaldi reported on March 1, Valentini, secure in his social rank, took pleasure in telling the city that he had turned to gambling only “after the cardinal forbade me to read the Gospel,” and even went so far as to make the gamblers retrieve an alms they had set aside for a poor man. 152 Nor would matters improve later, and the admonition of November 18, by which Morone ordered him under pain of excommunication to present himself at the episcopal palace, appears to have been of little use. 153

Still writing from Trent, where he was now the only legate present, on March 4, 1543, Morone asked Don Andrea Civolini, archpriest of the cathedral, to approach Countess Lucrezia Pico Rangoni and once again urge her to dismiss Don Girolamo Teggia from her household. By then Teggia was the principal figure in the city’s heretical movement, and she had chosen him as tutor to her son Fulvio. The noblewoman’s reply was evasive, limiting itself to an assertion of her formal observance of the religious duties appropriate to a lady of her rank. 154

All the refined distinctions, tortuous complexity, and indeed ambiguities of the faith of the *spirituali* - grounded in the doctrine of justification by faith while refusing to draw any ecclesiological consequences from it - seem reflected in Morone’s persistent commitment to dealing with the Modenese heresies precisely while he was embracing that doctrine, exploring its contents in discussions with Pole and Flaminio, and reading the works of Valdés and Fregoso. “I believe Your Most Reverend Lordship will have heard how matters stand in my city of Modena - I mean the bishopric - and I am of the opinion that unless some general provision is made, all Italy will shortly follow Germany,” he wrote to Marcello Cervini on April 14, 1543,

adding that “if the council makes no progress, it will be necessary to think of some other remedy.” 155 This reveals clearly that in embracing Valdesianism Morone was conscious of its profound difference from Lutheranism, yet at the same time remained very far from perceiving its distance from Roman teaching.

In any case, the very intensity of the conversion Morone experienced at Trent, his having been “enlightened” by Pole and Flaminio, could not fail to affect the way he governed the diocese, especially in relation to the religious dissent he had fought only months earlier in the prolonged confrontation with the Academicians, whose doctrinal choices he now shared at least in part. More generally, he could not avoid asking himself what goals and instruments should guide his pastoral action; what direction he should offer clergy and laity in pursuit of authentic religious renewal; how the refined Valdesian spiritualism, with its innate withdrawal from political struggle into the secrecy of conscience and its structural referral of the pressing problems of the present to the enlightenment of individual consciences and to the unfathomable designs of divine providence, could be translated into the concrete acts of teaching, admonishing, and issuing regulations; and finally, how he could act publicly while escaping the vigilance of the Roman Holy Office, which from the very day of its creation had regarded the irenic strategies of the bishop of Modena with suspicion.

A brief reference to the analogous problems Vittore Soranzo then faced at Bergamo may be useful. Soon after following Pietro Bembo to the Curia in 1539, after Bembo’s elevation to the cardinalate, Soranzo had become a disciple of Valdés at Naples. On his return to Rome, where he joined the *Ecclesia viterbiensis*, he appeared to his patron “to have become so good and true and certain a Christian, and […] so learned in Holy Scripture, that perhaps nowhere between here and Verona is there now anyone more religious, more humble, and more reverent toward our Lord Jesus Christ than he.” 156 Hence the decision in 1544 to entrust him with the government of Bembo’s Venetian diocese as coadjutor bishop with right of succession. 157 Soranzo moved there at the beginning of autumn, carrying with him the new religious identity acquired in Naples and Viterbo and a small library of heretical books. 158 It soon grew at Bergamo to include writings by Luther, Melanchthon, Butzer, Brenz, Vergerio, Ochino, Giulio da Milano, the two Valdés brothers, *Pasquino in Ecstasy*, *The Medicine of the Soul*, *The Tragedy of Free Will*, the *Summary of Holy Scripture*, and *The Benefit of Christ*. He kept the latter openly displayed in his rooms in the episcopal palace 159 and distributed dozens upon dozens of copies in Bergamo, undertaking to give it to anyone who asked. 160

These books were read, copied, given away, and lent to members of his household, suspect preachers, friars under suspicion of heresy, and in general to “people of prudence and understanding.” 161 One such person was the Bolognese heterodox thinker Giovan Battista Scotti, to whom Soranzo sent a copy of Valdés’s unpublished *Preguntas* annotated in his own hand, asking him to keep him informed “of your condition and that of the other brothers of Bologna, and likewise of Messer Ludovico Castelvetro and the others of Modena” 162 - clear evidence of his heretical complicities.

With these premises Soranzo set about governing the diocese of Bergamo and undertaking the delicate tasks this involved in directing the clergy, supervising preaching, and guiding the religious and moral life of the laity. The premises were clearly Valdesian, although Soranzo, like Carnesecchi, had by then “gone beyond Valdés’s doctrine in some respects,” drawing from it many “of those inferences which, once drawn, reveal it as Lutheran and heretical.” 163 Translating his doctrinal choice into concrete episcopal action now meant turning it into rules, decisions, and conduct. The unavoidable consequence was the abandonment of the Nicodemism always practiced by the Spanish exile’s disciples in their difficult attempt to mediate between the claims of conscience and those of prudence, with the evident risks this entailed. Soranzo did not always know how to avoid those risks, doubtless because of his fidelity to his religious choices, but perhaps also because his social rank and the powerful protections he knew he enjoyed in both Venice and Rome gave him a sense of impunity.

This is not the place to dwell on Soranzo’s pastoral work, which was soon interrupted by the opening of an inquisitorial trial in 1550, his summons to Rome, and his abjuration before Julius III the following year. It is enough to note that he was called to govern a clergy even worse, if possible, than that of Modena: ignorant,

nonresident, and riddled with every kind of abuse and arrogance, especially among the regular orders, where gross moral corruption went hand in hand with the unscrupulous exploitation of popular devotion. He surrounded himself with collaborators who held religious views similar to his own, beginning with his vicar Carlo Franchino, likewise condemned at Rome in 1551 as "instructed in Valdesian opinions," 164 and Cesare Flaminio, Marcantonio's cousin and a disciple of Valdés at Naples in the early 1540s, as well as many others. Soranzo sought to direct the faithful toward a different conception of Christian faith by choosing the parish priests of the principal churches in the city and the confessors of the women's convents. There he prohibited the recitation of the rosary and the reading of "books of devotions and prayers privileged by the Church" 165 and replaced them with Giulio da Milano's *Pious and Christian Epistles*, the *Summary of Holy Scripture*, the *Treatise of Saint Athanasius on the Simple and Pure Church of God* - all grounded in the doctrine of justification 166 - and above all Juan de Valdés's *Christian Alphabet*, which he ordered to be read in the refectory during meals, and *The Benefit of Christ*, of which he gave the nuns dozens upon dozens of copies.

Soranzo's teaching, however, was directed not only to the clergy but above all to the laity, the body of the faithful, through preaching. According to the city's inquisitor, "since the said bishop became bishop of Bergamo, and even when he was coadjutor, almost every year some preachers suspected or notorious for heresy have preached from the pulpit there," and they "were always magnifying faith and seemed to speak of nothing else." 167 The bishop himself would admit that he had protected "preachers who said *quod sola fides iustificat* [that faith alone justifies] and, in describing this faith, alluded to the Lutheran definition," while ensuring "for the sake of my honor that they did not openly reveal themselves against the Roman Church." 168 The same occurred with preachers sent into the towns of the district, whom the bishop always instructed to explain "that faith was what justified" and to refrain from attacking the Lutherans. 169 This led zealous friars to devise stratagems to escape strict episcopal control, pretending "to have little regard for the modern little Christian." 170

Equally significant - and often equally imprudent - was Soranzo's action in relation to the cult of the saints and the popular devotions connected with it. He sought to undermine the friars' support among ordinary people, whose customs were deeply marked by apotropaic rites, the objectification of the sacred, and superstitious practices. Fierce opposition greeted his order in 1549 to close the tomb of the legendary proto-bishop Saint Narno in order to combat belief in the healing powers of the water that flowed from it, not without "scandal and amazement throughout the city." All the more so because the bishop took the same measures against the similar devotion surrounding the tombs of the martyrs Fermo and Rustico, after discovering that nuns were pouring water into them during the night. He himself would admit to "having abolished many devotions to which the people flocked, […] because the priests made merchandise of them," relying on ignorant "common folk" to perpetuate intolerable abuses. 171

Other provisions issued by Soranzo struck at processions "to beseech God either for fair weather or for rain"; 172 at the crudest and most grotesque sacred images; at "the blessing of candles and the Hail Marys blessed by the pope"; 173 at vows made by "poor men […] burdened with children […] to go on long pilgrimages and leave their wives and families in misery and danger"; 174 and even at vows of chastity, from which he did not hesitate to release young women tempted "by the flesh," telling them: "I leave you as free as any other woman in the world, so that you may do whatever you wish." 175 Finally, no less significant in its contradictions was the protection he gave to gravely suspect individuals, whom on some occasions he did not hesitate to warn of impending inquisitorial action, sometimes enabling them to flee.

The records of pastoral visitations also reflect Soranzo's activity in the territories of the district, from the large towns of the plain to remote mountain villages. There he tried to wage his battle by adopting positions that crossed into heterodoxy while avoiding anti-Roman polemic. The result was a courageous attempt to begin a reform of the Church in the countryside and the valleys, based above all on the proclamation of the Word and a renewed sacramental practice, and to cut through the tangled knot of customs, collective needs, and interests that inextricably bound popular piety to the ignorance, laxity, and abuses of the clergy. 176 The intervention of the Roman Holy Office, however, soon revealed how narrow the margins for such a

reforming initiative had become. It was destined to remain imprisoned in the contradictions of Valdesianism and in the illusion that refusal of every institutional rupture could coexist with adherence to doctrines the fathers at Trent were preparing to condemn and that were already the object of inquisitorial repression. Those contradictions were especially evident in pastoral practice, whose public dimension reduced the spaces for caution, gradualism, and ambiguity on which the *spirituali* had built their fragile political strategies.

Chapter Seven

“Having Become a Lutheran, He Must Have Wished to Make All His People the Same”

1. “Their Brother in Matters of Faith”

To win souls for God “by wresting them from the devil’s service,” Juan de Valdés had written in the *Dialogue on Christian Doctrine* of 1529, “no means is more suitable today than to be a prelate,” and for this reason “those who undertake such offices do very well.” 1 Soranzo did indeed assume the direction of the diocese of Bergamo with enthusiasm in 1544, just as in 1543, after his religious transformation at Trent, Morone began to take a new interest in the diocese of Modena. The problems they had to confront were common, indeed almost identical. This is shown, for example, by the fact that the Milanese cardinal too ordered - something he had not done before - the closure of the legendary well of Saint Geminianus, in order to combat the popular belief that the water flowing from it cured fever. 2 Naturally, however, the activity of a nonresident bishop such as Morone could only be far more sporadic and fragmented than Soranzo’s. Since he always had to act through intermediaries, it was no accident that he devoted his attention above all to the choice of preachers.

For Lent 1543 he had to address this question even before the Tridentine legation, knowing full well that pulpits, alongside books, were the principal vehicle for the spread of heterodox doctrines. 3 It was a delicate choice, as he had already learned. 4 He would later say that he had approached it chiefly as part of his efforts to reabsorb the Modenese heresy, seeking to deal with “those strong and contaminated minds” through “kindness and confidence,” since in the absence of denunciations little or nothing could be achieved “by way of prosecution.” He therefore “went in search of preachers of good and sound doctrine and of a gentle and good spirit, who might bear fruit in their souls, but found it very difficult to find suitable men.” He had consequently decided to turn to Pole, whom he had only just met. With Colonna’s help, Pole succeeded in having his disciple, the already familiar Bernardo Bartoli, appointed, presenting him as “a good father […] who would be suitable for Modena.” 5 In his *confessio*, Morone would take care to stress that at the time he had “little knowledge” of the English cardinal, that Bartoli had also been favorably recommended by his religious superiors, and that the vicar had written to him that the friar “conducted himself well.” 6

On January 4, 1543, revealing the involvement of the entire *Ecclesia viterbiensis* in this attempt to influence Morone’s pastoral choices, the marchioness of Pescara wrote to thank him also on Bartoli’s behalf, now that the friar was about to depart, “and for that reason I have warned Messer Soranzo not to make any other provision.” 7 It was presumably then that Colonna revealed to Bartoli that Pole had succeeded in convincing “the Most Reverend Morone of this opinion concerning justification,” 8 just as he had earlier convinced both her and the friar himself. In speaking of it with a fellow Dominican, Bartoli confirmed the latter’s suspicions concerning the Milanese cardinal’s heresy “because of the very great familiarity he had with the lady marchioness of Pescara.” 9 Those suspicions were also held by another Dominican, the inquisitor of Perugia Matteo Lachi, who found confirmation in Bartoli’s residence at Viterbo and in his being sent to a city “held infamous for heresy” such as Modena. 10

The Florentine friar began preaching in the cathedral there on February 4, 1543, before a “large audience,” and set about establishing the Forty Hours’ devotion to the Eucharistic sacrament. 11 Yet little more than a month later, on March 13, Archpriest Andrea Civolini wrote to Morone that “the preacher is good, holy, and learned, but has few listeners.” 12 Bartoli would later tell the inquisitors that Morone had written to him twice from Trent, urging him “to preach the word of God fervently,” and had asked the vicar to keep him informed about the sermons. Toward the end of February the cardinal ordered Sigibaldi to summon “all the priests authorized to hear confessions” and explain to them that “Christ was the one who

absolved" - or "the one who had justified us," as Bartoli would put it. 13 The result was explosive in a city torn by religious conflict.

The Lutheran infection - the vicar wrote, somewhat confusedly, on March 1, 1543 14 - has so thoroughly occupied the bodily senses and the spiritual taste of this people in general that on weekdays no more than 200, 250, or perhaps 300 persons attend the sermon. On holy days of obligation the cathedral fills, but they often interpret the words in the opposite sense, always drawing them toward their own meaning. *Hinc est* [hence it is] that, having summoned the parish priests and informed them of what Your Most Reverend and Illustrious Lordship wrote to me - namely, that they should exhort the people to confession not mechanically or merely from habit, but with inward sorrow for their sins, explaining the three parts of penance: heartfelt contrition, devout oral confession to a lawful priest, and satisfaction through holy works, prayers, alms, fasts, pilgrimages, and works of corporal and spiritual mercy - yet without placing their foundation simply in those good works, but in the merits of the Passion of Jesus Christ, from whom every good work of ours receives its power, and which His Majesty accepts through his goodness and even chooses to reward as our good works and to give us recompense for them, because he does not wish us to remain idle but to exercise ourselves in good works, striving on our part to do less evil and as much good as we can, always committing ourselves to his mercy, through which we ought to hope and believe that he will grant us blessed life: this was the substance of the address I gave them plainly, without mincing words, in a loud and intelligible voice in the sacristy, where there were about thirty-five or forty priests.

The next morning, however, a carpenter "regarded as the trumpet of the sect" began publicly proclaiming his heresies. He declared that this "was the true way, confirmed" by Morone, whose letter to the vicar - contrary to what the latter maintained - had instructed him to warn the people "that it was no longer necessary for them to attend Mass, fast, keep Lent, or perform other works, because Christ had made satisfaction for us without so much confessing or doing penance." Tensions, protests, and trials followed, while those who "wished the bishop ill" showered him with insinuations. 15 To safeguard the bishop's good name, Sigibaldi could think of nothing better than to send Morone at Trent the text of a letter and ask him to return it bearing his signature, so that the vicar might use it against the heterodox.

Meanwhile, a priest, Don Francesco della Croce, indifferent to every warning, indulged himself by buying butter in the marketplace to season his gnocchi despite the Lenten season. 16 Some time later Morone would have him arrested for mocking the relic of Saint Domninus's tooth preserved in the cathedral at Fidenza, saying that "Saint Domninus must have been a giant, or else the tooth belonged to a lion or some other animal." Despite what had happened in the summer of 1542, the "sect" therefore seemed to flourish luxuriantly under the leadership of Don Girolamo Teggia. He behaved like a "prince," a "pope" courted by everyone and believed "as though he were Saint Paul." If he could have been banished from Modena, "the head would be cut off this diabolical synagogue," Sigibaldi wrote, while nevertheless having to acknowledge that no one dared denounce him and that the heretical pestilence appeared to grow stronger every day.

The cardinal's ambiguous messages had drawn the vicar himself into the controversy, and his efforts to show that letter to everyone did nothing to "repair the disgrace." He therefore decided to have it read from the cathedral pulpit to silence the "members of the sect" who exulted through the city, crying: "Praise God, the cardinal has opened his eyes and is beginning to recognize the truth!" 17 Bartoli was thus not alone in interpreting the letter - "scandalous, dangerous, and erroneous," he would later call it - as proof of Morone's adherence to the doctrine of "justification according to the Lutheran interpretation." 18 The heterodox, and especially the Academicians, were the first to make "a great celebration" of it and spread the news, thanking heaven with "great contentment" that "our Most Reverend Cardinal Morone has become one of us."

Hence the bewilderment of poor Sigibaldi, a "good and Catholic man" but, in Bartoli's judgment, ignorant "of these new doctrines." He had tried to defend the bishop by "blaming the Lutherans, who had misunderstood." In truth, it was he who had failed to understand the sense of the writing. He asked Bartoli to read it from the pulpit while "giving it a Catholic meaning." Bartoli did so, but without reciting the text itself, so as not to rekindle the "great tumult" it had caused. 19

During the trial Morone would say that he had received flattering reports from the vicar about Bartoli and would admit writing that letter, which later mysteriously disappeared from the Modenese archives, as will be seen. 20 According to him, it was the friar, not the vicar, who was supposed to exhort the faithful "to hope for the remission of sins from Christ," and to teach that doctrine to confessors "for the benefit of penitents." Bartoli, however, "perhaps thinking he was doing well," allegedly took it upon himself to read the letter in public, creating "a great commotion, because the wicked represented it as saying something other than it did." For this reason, after the vicar informed him of what was happening in Modena, Morone sought to silence the heretics. 21 On March 7 he recommended that Sigibaldi instruct the parish priests, "in the confessions of poor ignorant people," to follow the provisions of the *Concilium coloniense*. 22 This was the edition of the canons of the provincial council assembled at Cologne in 1538 by Archbishop Hermann von Wied, with the substantial *Enchiridion christianae institutionis* of Johannes Gropper appended to it. Gropper had played a leading role in the Regensburg colloquies. The *Enchiridion* would later be condemned in the Index of Paul IV in 1559, but its formulas on the doctrine of justification and its reforming irenicism were appreciated by Cortese, Soranzo, Flaminio, Bembo, Contarini, Pole, and Giberti, who had it printed at Verona in 1541 and again in 1543. 23

In the *confessio* written in prison after his arrest, Morone would say that he knew "some ill-phrased things, suspect of heresy, not to say heretical," had been discovered in that work. Yet in 1543 the *Concilium coloniense* had seemed to him a valuable guide for priests in the confessional. In an effort to explain the embarrassing message of his first letter in purely pastoral rather than doctrinal terms, he would evoke a conversation with the elderly parish priest of a remote Apennine village, who "could not resolve in what manner God, being both merciful and just, forgave sins to him and to other men." Morone explained "that our sins deserved God's severe justice, but that toward the truly penitent and confessed, and so forth, this justice was turned into mercy for the love of Jesus Christ, who had suffered death on the cross to appease the Father and obtain our salvation." The priest began to weep, fell to his knees, and thanked him for showing him "the way by which he might obtain the remission of his sins, having until then always doubted within himself how God, being just, could exercise mercy toward sinners." 24 Whatever the truth of this episode, it is clear that Morone's pastoral directions after the religious transformation he underwent in those months could be exploited by the Modenese heterodox, who were ready to bend his new Valdesian orientation in a Reformed direction.

After completing his Lenten preaching in Modena, Bartoli traveled to Trent, arriving after Easter at the end of March to meet Morone, who received him "with the greatest kindness." 25 He remained for a little over a week and was able to confirm what Colonna had told him about the cardinal's recent conversion, returning to Viterbo "most satisfied and most obliged," as the marchioness reported on May 20, 1543. 26 The Milanese cardinal himself told him openly that he had at last "known Christ," referring to the doctrine of justification according to Luther, and confided that he owed to Pole the revelation of that "great light of the Church, hidden for a long time." Morone wished to send him back to Modena "to reside for a year or more, at his pleasure," to read the Bible there and preach "this new doctrine to the people […], but in such a way as not to scandalize the people." He was therefore to avoid invective and controversy, ground himself solely in the words of the Gospel, and "very often recall the benefit of Christ, impressing it upon human hearts." 27

It was then, through Giberti, that Morone succeeded in obtaining papal authorization for Bartoli to read prohibited books so that he could study "this article of justification in Luther." His superiors, however, recalled him to Viterbo, for they already suspected Morone "in these Lutheran matters." 28 At Trent Bartoli also frequented members of the cardinal's household, among them his steward, the already mentioned Modenese priest Domenico Morando. 29 According to Giovan Battista Scotti, Morando "was regarded by the Lutherans of Modena as their brother in opinion." 30 Knowing that he was speaking to someone who shared his views on justification, Morando asked Bartoli what difference there was "between Pelagians and Catholics," repeating what the cardinal had told him: that "without this new light of the Lutherans it was difficult to escape the doctrine of the Pelagians." His remarks on the abuses of the Apostolic Penitentiary likewise convinced Bartoli "that he had a touch of Lutheranism." 31

In August 1543 Morone returned to his diocese from a council that "will never be held again," 32 intending to give new life and substance to his reforming commitment. It then became known that the Modenese heterodox "were making a great celebration and rejoicing, saying that […] he had been enlightened by the truth and had become their brother in matters of faith, and […] praising him as highly as they could." He supposedly showed "great affection" to some of them who had the courage to visit him, apologized to them, and "almost asked their forgiveness for having previously troubled them in matters of faith." 33 Many people appear to have known and whispered about it. 34 Among them was the ever well-informed Scotti, then in Modena and in contact with the leading members of the Academy, who told him what had happened at Trent.

According to Scotti, the Modenese "brothers" had begun to suspect "how the matter of his change had occurred" when, at Easter, Morone wrote to his vicar to have it "announced to the people that they were justified solely by the blood of Christ," of which they "made a great boast." 35 Still more disconcerting is the fact that what "emboldened those Modenese to approach His Most Reverend Lordship so freely were letters written to them […] by Messer Marcantonio Flaminio." From Trent, Flaminio had made them participants in the "good news that their bishop, namely the Most Reverend Morone, had become one of them and loved them." 36 This vividly confirms the direct relations connecting the Modenese Academicians with the *Ecclesia viterbiensis*, which only a few months earlier had sent them Valdés's catechism to set against Giberti's. 37 The same was happening at Naples, where Apollonio Merenda kept Giulia Gonzaga informed of Morone's progress toward becoming "receptive to justification through Christ." 38

In short, the man who until the summer of 1542 "had sought to punish many of his Modenese as Lutherans" carried out "no further persecution" after his return from Trent, and would continue in the same manner after being appointed legate of Bologna in 1544. 39 Earlier he had forbidden the bookseller Antonio Gadaldino to sell, without his own or the vicar's permission, the *Summary of Holy Scripture*, 40 certain "catechisms and expositions of the Our Father" arriving from Venice, and any "newly printed book of Holy Scripture." 41 Yet on returning from Trent, "when copies of *The Benefit of Christ* arrived," he urged the bookseller to sell as many as possible. Knowing that the book was expensive, like all prohibited books, he replied that "if there were some poor person who lacked the means to pay for it," he would cover the cost from his own pocket. 42 These words were all the more compromising because the cardinal knew Gadaldino to be "a great Lutheran." He had been one of the Modenese heretics who, after Morone returned from Trent, "felt secure enough to visit him and reveal their doctrine to him." 43

Although Morone would later maintain that he first saw *The Benefit* when Gadaldino showed him a freshly printed copy of the Venetian edition of 1543, he actually already possessed a manuscript, which he kept "in a small chest" - undoubtedly the copy Flaminio had given him at Trent and "which had greatly pleased him." 44 He would admit that he read it "and almost devoured it with great avidity," judging it "very spiritual," also because it was "printed in Rome" and had long been "regarded as pious and Catholic and read by learned and Catholic men." The vicar's approval and its "magnificent title" had encouraged him to spread it in Modena, "all the more because it was attributed to Flaminio, then regarded as pious and Catholic." 45 Only later was he informed "that people were murmuring against this book." Out of scruple he consulted Cardinal Cortese, then a member of the Holy Office, who gave him a very favorable opinion, as did Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo of Trent some time later, though Morone advised Madruzzo to distance himself from it "because objections are raised against it." Others took a different view, and since "the murmuring" continued, he eventually decided to lay the treatise aside, though it had not yet been prohibited. 46

Several Modenese witnesses would provide further confirmation of the bishop's efforts to spread *The Benefit*, the repository of the doctrines of the *spirituali*. A Dominican, for example, would report that the first suspicions against Morone arose when he gave a copy of *The Benefit* to a Modenese noblewoman, Barbara Pazzani, then close to Ludovica Torelli, the already mentioned countess of Guastalla, disciple and protector of Fra Battista da Crema, 47 "telling her that she should study that little book as a very Christian work." Yet Pazzani herself, evidently marked more by Fra Battista's ascetic rigorism than by his radical spiritualism, detected "some Lutheran errors in the book" and gave it to the city's inquisitor, although at first she had

admired Bartoli's sermons and suggested "keeping him in Modena for the entire year." 48 The bishop's support for the treatise became so widely known that some Modenese Dominicans and "many laypeople" gave credence to the false report "that the said little book had been printed at Cardinal Morone's order by Master Antonio, a bookseller in Modena." 49

A few weeks later, in January 1544, the Milanese cardinal saw Bartoli again at Rome, as the friar prepared to leave for Otranto, where Archbishop Pietro Antonio Di Capua had entrusted him with the cathedral pulpit for Lent, giving him several books by Luther and instructing him not to preach the doctrine of Saint Thomas. 50 On that occasion Morone gave him two anonymous little books "entitled *The Benefit of Christ*," telling him to give one "to a companion." Bartoli liked the treatise so much that he tried to buy additional copies from a Roman bookseller to take to Otranto and give "to those who did not know," only to be told that "they could not be kept, because they were prohibited." 51

2. The Clash with Alfonso Salmerón

After the order's leaders refused to grant Morone's wish that Bartoli return to Modena, his choice fell on a young "reformed priest" belonging to a new religious order, the Jesuit Alfonso Salmerón. Morone had met him briefly the previous year, when he had lodged him for one night in Modena. He was probably struck on that occasion by the Spaniard's fervor and intelligence and decided to rely on him also as a means of escaping the friars' monopoly. While still at Trent, he therefore wrote to Ignatius of Loyola asking him to send one of his followers to Modena to preach to the people. 52 In those same days, on April 10, 1543, he suggested to Marcello Cervini - as he had done before - that the Jesuit Claude Le Jay be sent to Cologne, expressing deep concern over the spread of heresy not only in his diocese but throughout Italy. 53

Yet precisely because Loyola's followers sprang from roots of dubious orthodoxy, in many respects close to the Valdesian matrix, and preserved within the order a secret inheritance of those origins, 54 while presenting themselves externally as staunch defenders of Roman orthodoxy, it is possible that Morone knew or sensed something of those roots. He may therefore have assumed that Salmerón intended to give space in his sermons to the theme of justifying grace, so much so that he abandoned all caution in recommending that he preach "the Gospel without so many merits of the saints and of ourselves." 55 Indeed, the dispatch of heterodox friars such as Bartoli in 1543 and Pergola in 1544 makes it difficult to believe that Morone chose the Jesuit because he was "learned and well instructed against the Lutherans," 56 as he would later claim. In any event, it was an unfortunate decision and not without consequences.

Salmerón preached at Modena every Sunday and feast day for four months, from Easter until the end of August 1543, provoking much "uproar" and "many complaints" because, according to some, he was "too proud, arrogant, and odious" and named "particular sins and sinners from the pulpit without distinction of person or circumstance." 57 Some witnesses for Morone's defense would recall that the Jesuit spoke "forcefully and vehemently," behaved "insolently," and played "ugly parts," swollen with pride but also "dirty in eating and gluttonous." 58 Morone had already been informed at Trent by several Modenese and by the city's governor himself. Irritated by such indiscreet and insolent preaching, he decided to end the scandal caused by the Spanish Jesuit, who seemed better suited to agitate than to pacify minds.

All the more so because, as soon as he returned to Modena, Morone heard a sermon that appeared to confirm what had been reported. He finally admonished Salmerón in a private conversation, during which the Jesuit allegedly behaved with such arrogance that he railed against Morone himself, showing no respect for episcopal authority or cardinalatial dignity. 59 Morone then abruptly suspended the series of sermons. According to the Jesuit, this resulted from pressure exerted by the many heterodox inhabitants who could not tolerate his insistence on justification in opposition to the Lutherans, and his explanation that works "performed in God's grace" were "meritorious of eternal life and […] could make satisfaction to God for temporal penalties." 60

This was the central point on which Morone chose to intervene, because what he heard "did not greatly satisfy His Lordship," as the Spanish priest discovered in several private conversations in which the

cardinal’s statements seemed analogous to those of the heretics. He became certain of it when Morone rashly answered him that “for the best work he performed he deserved hell, as when he went to say Mass.” In the *confessio* written in Castel Sant’Angelo, the cardinal would have to admit that he had said “many foolish things” while quarreling with that “bold and learned young man,” who “spoke very forcefully,” and that he had been “more insolent than he.” 61 He denied, however, ever saying that works had no meritorious value, much less that they were always sins; he meant only that his own good works seemed few and imperfect. 62

The heterodox added to the tension. Publicly rebuked by name by the Jesuit, they had, according to Morone, seized on a sermon about the real presence of Christ’s body in the Eucharist to insinuate cunningly that Salmerón preached “Lutheran things under the guise of refuting them,” as for a moment the bishop seemed to believe. 63 In reality, when Salmerón was finally suspended from preaching, the city was deeply shaken, not least because the suspect figures were the first to rejoice. 64 After asking Loyola to recall him to Rome and receiving permission, before departing the young Jesuit administered a *correctio fraterna* to the cardinal. He told him that the popular disturbance and the suspicions against him had arisen because Morone had compromised the esteem and prestige he enjoyed. 65

Later, when the brief season of Valdesian militancy had ended, Morone would acknowledge his error and apologize to Salmerón, showing “that he had changed completely and now possessed a Catholic mind and spirit.” But in the summer of 1543 the incident became a case that reached Paul III’s ears. Saint Ignatius, himself repeatedly tried for heresy in the past, could not accept the episode without responding. He asked Cervini to seek a formal intervention from the pontiff to determine whether Salmerón had preached “in a Catholic manner or not.” On that occasion the Jesuit showed Ambrogio Catarino Politi about a dozen articles, evidently Lutheran in flavor, attributed to Morone and already forwarded to Paul III. They later came into the hands of the Burgundian Dominican Gabriel Martenet, who was commissioned - it is not known when or by whom - to transcribe some of them and deliver them to the cardinals of the Curia, informing them of what was happening at Modena, where the bishop allowed Catholic doctrine to be condemned and Lutheran doctrine spread. 66

The Milanese cardinal in turn intervened “through influence” to obstruct such an inquiry. He ultimately induced the pope, on two separate occasions, to reverse course and inform the Jesuits that nothing would be done, to prevent the affair from “bringing dishonor upon the cardinalate,” while assuring them that he retained complete confidence in their orthodoxy. In any case, according to Salmerón, the episode left deep traces not only at Rome, where Morone’s good name began to crack, but also at Modena. There the “joy” of the heretics was opposed by the anxiety of Catholics, dismayed by the bishop’s explicit collusion with those he ought to have fought and suppressed. Salmerón would observe that the best proof of Morone’s doctrinal deviations was the preacher he chose for Modena shortly afterward, Bartolomeo della Pergola, who “uttered many heresies, and a trial was conducted against him which I have seen here in Rome.” He did not explain by what right he had been permitted to violate the secrecy of the Holy Office. 67

The religious climate of the city therefore remained tense. On December 2, 1543, Lancillotti noted that “before Advent there is no preaching, because no preacher can come, however excellent, without being criticized by certain learned men of Modena; and for this reason no one wishes to come here to contend with so many men on their own ground.” 68 By then Morone had already left the diocese after a stop on his return journey from Trent, and had then resumed the road to Rome with Cortese. 69 There, on December 17, he held a long conversation with the pope about the ever-pressing German questions. 70

A few months later, on April 2, 1544, 71 Paul III appointed Morone legate of Bologna, entrusting him with the government of the second city of the Papal States. 72 The onerous duties of the post compelled him to reduce greatly his pastoral presence in nearby Modena. In Bologna too his relations with people connected to the heterodox world would arouse suspicions and, worse still, provide the Holy Office with evidence and documents against him. 73 In 1551-52, for example, Giovan Battista Scotti would give the Roman inquisitors several letters attesting to relations he had previously maintained with numerous heterodox figures. Among

them were letters Soranzo and Carnesecchi sent him in April 1544 to congratulate him, as a Bolognese, on Morone's appointment.

"I rejoice with all my heart at the favor God has shown you in giving you the Most Reverend Morone as legate," wrote the Florentine protonotary, "for certainly there could have been no man in the world better suited to the needs of that city, both temporal and spiritual." He hoped that God would "give him to you for longer than he gave Cardinal Contarini, so that his holy name may be all the more glorified in that city." Greeting the Bolognese "friends," he enclosed with the letter "a small gathering of those things you desire, asking you to take good care of it" - almost certainly a writing by Valdés - and requested that it be returned "at the first opportunity by a trustworthy person" after it had been copied. 74

Soranzo, for his part, could only share his friend's "joy" at Morone's appointment, which was to be interpreted as "a most singular favor God has shown you": 75

I am very pleased to hear - he wrote in typically Valdesian language - that [the brothers] attend more to the experience of the Christian matter than to knowledge. Knowledge makes us proud and often causes scandal; experience always edifies everyone and humbles us. As regards the Most Reverend legate, it does not seem to me necessary to make any approach to him on this matter, since that would be superfluous: I know that the charity God has given him will teach him everything necessary.

It was, in effect, a true summons into complicity. This is confirmed by what the bishop of Bergamo wrote Scotti on May 17, urging him to appeal to the legate with complete confidence if he needed help, and promising to write "in recommendation of you" whenever asked. He later preferred to postpone doing so, so that he might intervene more effectively "in person" during his journey to Bergamo to take possession of the diocese. If that proved impossible, he would do it "by letters," he reassured him on June 8. Little more than a month later he informed him that he would soon pass through Bologna, where he would take care to ask Morone for the letter Scotti desired. 76

Scotti would summarize these and other letters from Soranzo and Carnesecchi effectively, saying that they had written "to the Lutherans of Bologna, rejoicing with them at the favor done them by giving them such a man as their superior," and that the bishop of Bergamo nevertheless "exhorted them not to do scandalous things under the pretext of having a favorable legate, lest the legate then be forced to punish their imprudence." 77

3. The Case of Bartolomeo della Pergola

It was immediately after Morone's appointment to his new and demanding office at Bologna that the most embarrassing incident of all occurred for him in Modena, all the more so because it followed so closely upon the clash with Salmerón: the trial opened by the Holy Office - first at Modena and then at Rome - against the Franciscan Bartolomeo Golfi della Pergola, whom Morone had sent to Modena to preach during Lent 1544. About forty-six years old at the time, regent of the University of Ferrara and procurator general of the order, he had begun to move away from the Catholic faith after discussions with Andrea Ghetti da Volterra during Lent 1540 at Naples. Ochino was also preaching there, and Vermigli, Flaminio, Carnesecchi, Soranzo, and other disciples of Valdés were then resident in the city.

Having become *magister theologiae* at Bologna in 1541, Pergola preached Advent two years later at San Lorenzo in Damaso in Rome, where numerous heterodox listeners came to hear him. His sermons, based on "Brenz's teachings," which he had attempted to conceal as effectively as possible by preaching "as covertly as he could," 78 had emphasized above all justification by faith alone. In frequent private conversations Soranzo, then on the eve of his appointment as bishop of Bergamo, gave him several works by Valdés, while Giannetti gave him a freshly printed copy of *The Benefit of Christ*. 79 Recommended by Soranzo to Morone, 80 who obtained him by diverting him from the Florentine assignment his superiors had given him, Pergola preached "many heresies" at Modena. 81

According to Scotti, that “thorough Lutheran of the Order of Friars Minor” had been chosen by the cardinal “in full knowledge of what sort of person he was,” because “having become a Lutheran, he must have wished to make all his people of Modena the same.” The letters of several heterodox figures had also told Scotti that they “rejoiced greatly at having such a preacher, who preached the truth openly to them in their own manner.” 82 Bartoli would say that he had only met Pergola briefly at Rome, but at the beginning of the year had seen him with Flaminio and Priuli in Morone’s palace, “instructing and encouraging him to preach this new Lutheran doctrine” concerning justification. This offered evidence of the explicit complicity then established between Pole’s associates and the Milanese cardinal in their common effort to spread Valdesian spirituality. 83 On that occasion they had stressed “how good and useful it was to impress the righteousness of Christ upon men’s minds, and that this was the opinion that removed all pride and presumption and perfectly healed man,” leaving no doubt that the cardinal knew of Pergola’s heresies.

Bartoli was later told by a Modenese fellow friar that the Franciscan had begun by saying that the bishop had chosen him precisely so that he might preach “Christ naked, and not so many tales and so many merits and so many things.” 84 “What I teach you, O Modena,” he allegedly said, “I teach you with the participation of your prelate.” 85 Pergola would maintain that he had spoken only of the bishop’s love for his church and not of the doctrine he was about to preach, but only because Morone had instructed him to say nothing “of what he had discussed with him, namely the intercession of the saints and predestination,” thereby aggravating the evidence of complicity. 86

The friar did not hesitate to report that before sending him to Modena the cardinal had wished to test his opinions concerning “these Lutheran matters, and especially the invocation of the saints, justification, and predestination.” Morone had raised no objection to his heterodox doctrines; “indeed, he spoke of them more than I did,” indicating that he shared “the aforesaid opinions of Luther.” Only after two or three such conversations did he instruct Pergola to preach in Modena “according to what he had discussed with him *ad mentem Lutheri* [in accordance with Luther’s mind]”: namely, that one should not pray for the saints to intercede on one’s behalf, that justification depends upon God’s grace alone, that predestination is immutable, and that one who is predestined cannot be damned. 87 Pergola especially recalled a meal in Morone’s residence at which the cardinal, in the presence of many people, stubbornly opposed the view expressed by a bishop on the invocation of the saints. 88

The friar also stated that when Soranzo introduced him to Morone, he made the cardinal understand his religious orientation; otherwise Pergola would “never have felt safe speaking of Lutheran matters with His Most Reverend Lordship.” For this reason, “after the conversations we had together about these subjects, it is impossible that he did not know me to be a Lutheran.” 89 Yet while granting Pergola broad permission to preach *ad mentem Lutheri*, Morone forbade him to defend Lutheran views on the sacrament of the Eucharist, because the Lutherans “were mistaken in this.” 90

This was not a personal position more or less at odds with the religious conclusions Morone had reached, nor a defense of Catholic tradition. It was a central point in the pedagogy of Valdesians and *spirituali*, expressing the need to preserve the unity of the Church, whose most solid sacramental and liturgical bond lay in the celebration of that rite. This was so not merely or primarily because of the theological questions concerning the doctrine of the real presence of Christ’s body in the consecrated host - these were certainly not matters in which Morone could or wished to engage - but because celebration of the Lord’s Supper in the Calvinist manner signified definitive rupture with the Catholic Church and the choice of a new and different ecclesial allegiance. For this reason, only a few months earlier, in a celebrated letter to Carnesecchi, Flaminio had condemned the “false doctrine” of the Protestants, and especially the adherents of the “abominable Zwinglian sect.” 91

Consistently with these premises, Morone would write in his *confessio* that he had appreciated *The Benefit of Christ* also because “it spoke with great devotion of communion,” and that he had always believed that anyone who denied the sacraments did not share his own doctrine of justification and in any event drew “different consequences” from it, because he himself could not live without “the sacraments and works.” 92

For this reason he wished to include among the documents for his defense two lines from a letter sent from Trent on December 18, 1542, to one of his household, recommending that he confess and receive communion at the approaching Christmas, together with “all our other people, […] as good Christians ought to do.” 93

Carnesecchi used a specific phrase for those who, beginning from Valdesian premises, had ultimately entered the Reformed churches: they had “gone into deep water.” This was how he described, for example, the Spaniard Juan Morillo, a member of Pole’s household at Trent who later “plunged into heresies, whether Lutheran or Calvinist I do not know,” and Apollonio Merenda, who likewise ended as a sacramentarian. 94 The protonotary himself ultimately preferred to follow the counsel and example of his masters and stop at the very edge of the heretical abyss. “I was horrified at the thought of having to separate myself from the body of the Catholic Church in a matter of such importance,” 95 he would say, summarizing the meaning and peculiarity of his religious experience.

There is no doubt that Morone shared such premises. They enabled him to wear the purple and occupy important positions at the summit of the papal Church without renouncing the “sweet” doctrine of *The Benefit of Christ*, and indeed to give it a specific pastoral meaning. His instructions to Pergola about what he should teach the faithful were therefore consistent with his new religious identity.

On February 27, 1544, Lancillotti recorded the beginning of the Lenten sermons before a “large audience,” in the presence of the governor, ducal officials, and the entire clergy. Yet “all those of the Academy, more than twenty-five of them, down to a certain Messer Antonio the bookseller,” also came to hear Pergola, doubtless already informed of his religious views, as did “the women of that faction, for which reason he preaches rather broadly.” A few days later the friar was warned to be careful “before seeking to please those sirens, lest they then cause him to fall.” This did not induce him to preach differently. He always referred back to the Gospel and never mentioned “saints, doctors of the Church, Lent, fasting, or many other things that please the Academicians.” Hence the Modenese chronicler’s conviction that many attended those “licentious” sermons only “to learn the broad road” to salvation, the means of “going to paradise in padded stockings, because he says that Christ has paid for us.”

As a man of order, old Lancillotti deplored that Pergola did not admonish the people “as he ought,” regardless of the dangerous social consequences of his teaching. “Were it possible, many would wish to do whatever they pleased and afterward beat their breasts and pay their debt,” he wrote, not without some surprise that Morone had sent Pergola to Modena “regarding him as a little saint.” 96 The early suspicion of many Catholics that their bishop “was a Lutheran” arose precisely from his favor toward Pergola, “who preached very many Lutheran articles in that wretched city.” 97 Numerous sources document the success of his sermons and their importance in the maturing of Modenese heresy in the following years, not only among artisans, weavers, shoemakers, and common people, but also among the city’s leading citizens.

As late as 1551 the Jesuit Silvestro Landino would inform Rome that the “few who wrote against Pergola are pointed out with the words, ‘Behold the Pharisees!’” The following year Count Giovanni Rangoni, one of the “great men” of the community of “brothers,” would declare that he owed Pergola *maiorem obligationem quam patri suo* [a greater debt than to his own father]. 98 Particularly eloquent is the testimony of the city’s governor, Francesco Villa, who was close to the doctrines of the innovators. On April 7, 1544, he wrote the Este duke that Pergola “preaches the Gospel, to which he gives the expositions ordained by Holy Scripture,” although he did not fail to notice that the friar spoke “under a covering of shining thread as a mask”: 99

For my part - he added - I would pay half my property, and I speak in earnest, if the baptized governed themselves in the manner this man teaches; for if they did, one might say that this was a golden age, not a dissolute and self-interested age, without any love in the world for one’s neighbor, as ours is. I therefore praise him, all the more because a year ago he preached at Rome, where he drew a great audience, and being thus approved was sent here by the Most Reverend Morone. And although those who condemn him say that both the Most Reverend cardinal and this man are Lutherans, I do not know what to say, because the pope,

who is the enemy of such men, not only tolerates them now but seems to exalt them, since he has given the aforesaid Most Reverend cardinal the legation of Bologna, which is the foremost office of honor bestowed. I therefore conclude that even if Luther's opinion were not good, Christendom nevertheless owes him a debt, since because of him everyone has set about discovering the nature of our faith and the manner in which we ought to conduct ourselves.

Sigibaldi did not fail to notice the popularity of these sermons, but at first he did not grasp their heterodox inflections. "So far he seems to me to be well received and to hold sound doctrine, and I hear no murmuring against him, which seems remarkable in this city, so sharp-nosed and divided by dogmas," he wrote Morone on March 3, 1544. 100 On March 14 he confirmed that the friar "proceeds well, learnedly, and in a Catholic manner, although many misunderstand him," and assured the bishop, who had asked for news, that Pergola "always preaches on the Gospel," to the point that Sigibaldi declared himself "a slave to his holy doctrine." 101 The cardinal was pleased by these reports but urged the vicar to remain vigilant and inform him immediately if he heard "anything scandalous," knowing full well that Pergola "does not lack calumniators," as he wrote on March 29. 102

The situation in Modena nevertheless remained extremely tense. This is also indicated by the letter sent to Morone the day before by Antonio Fiordibello, secretary to Cardinal Sadoleto. He reported that several of Pergola's assertions had scandalized him so deeply that he left the church and decided to warn the bishop "that the said preacher did not preach according to Scripture, and that His Most Reverend Lordship should provide that he not ensnare this city," as Lancillotti had already noted. 103 In his reply of April 8 the cardinal expressed regret, but explained that he had received excellent reports about Pergola and would conduct a careful investigation of his preaching shortly, after taking possession of the Bolognese legation. "There is nothing for which I consider myself more responsible," he assured Fiordibello, "than maintaining holy and Catholic doctrine, which always goes together with the authority and preservation of this Holy See, for which you know that I am bound to expend not only my authority and resources but life itself." 104

When Morone wrote these words he was undoubtedly aware that the suspicions, rumors, and religious tensions provoked in Modena by Pergola's messages had already induced the local Inquisition to open an investigation. The numerous testimonies it collected made it possible to formulate seventeen charges, which Lancillotti had the opportunity to see. 105 "They said that I had preached in a Lutheran fashion, as indeed I had preached, especially on the subject of works," the friar would admit. 106 The cardinal followed with intense concern this trial, which had escaped his control. He would later seek to give the impression that he knew only that the core of the accusations concerned justification by faith. In reality, the Pergola affair caused him grave embarrassment, forcing him to overcome no few difficulties in order "to save him after the sermons, because he said many scandalous things," as Flaminio informed Fra Bernardo Bartoli. 107

The situation at Modena had reached breaking point, as was also shown by the sensational iconoclastic "villainy" of several scoundrels who gouged out the eyes of images of the saints. 108 The bishop had to change his tone - at least outwardly - and provide himself with some protection. Aware that the incident with Salmerón had fueled suspicions against him, he professed public and private indignation at Pergola's conduct while at the same time seeking to rescue the friar from the claws of the Holy Office. Thus, when a distinguished Bolognese citizen wished to recommend Pergola, who was going about saying that he had been "slandered […] and falsely accused of speaking heretically," Morone flew into a rage and accused the man of wishing to intercede for a "Lutheran," a "wretch" who deserved punishment. 109

Another Bolognese, the Lateran canon regular Arcangelo Rossi, would later report that upon receiving confirmation of the heresies preached by the friar, the cardinal "became greatly disturbed," growing in anger "paler than a linen cloth," and complained bitterly that his vicar, the canons and clergy, and his other noblemen and friends in the city of Modena had not warned him in time. 110 As has been seen, this was not true. A kind of *excusatio non petita* can also be detected in the letter of May 25, 1544, in which Morone took care to tell the vicar of his conviction that "works performed by us, even after justification, receive reward or recompense" from God, and asked him to press for the inquiry to be concluded as quickly as possible. 111

Through Beccadelli, his secretary at Bologna, 112 he also sought Pole's opinion. On May 17 Pole advised him to send a trusted person to Modena in order "to establish the whole truth" and then employ "severe correction": against Pergola if the accusations proved true, or otherwise against his "informers." His intervention, however, was anything but neutral, since he told Morone of the excellent opinion held by "our Monsignor Soranzo, who heard Pergola throughout Lent last year and has since dealt very intimately […] with him." Pole was convinced that the charges were merely "calumnies, born of conflicts among friars and perhaps from others as well," who believed they were pleasing God "by persecuting those who magnify his grace." 113

Things were not quite so. By then the situation had become still more complicated because Pergola had unexpectedly been summoned by the Roman Holy Office, which evidently attached the greatest importance to the inquiry, doubtless because of Morone's involvement. The cardinal therefore tried to anticipate its moves. Taking advantage of his authority as bishop and cardinal, and in defiance of every procedural rule, he succeeded in obtaining a copy of the Modenese trial. In a still more serious breach of inquisitorial secrecy, he showed it to Pergola himself, whom he summoned immediately to Bologna, and asked for his version of the facts: "How did you explain this article and this one?" Seeking hurriedly to construct a local solution that would make intervention by the supreme tribunal of the faith unnecessary, Morone ordered the friar to write "a declaration *in scriptis*" and deliver it to the inquisitor of Bologna, the mild Tommaso Maria Beccadelli, who supplemented and corrected it at several points. 114

On June 13 Priuli informed him from Rome that he had discussed the case with Cardinal Badia, who had "heard much murmuring" about Pergola, and that he had read a newly delivered letter from the friar to Morone, which gave "good hope that the said father ought to be vindicated." 115 The Milanese cardinal probably also knew that at the beginning of the month the duke of Ferrara had sent his ambassador in Rome the text of the charges against the friar, to show them to the Modenese cardinals and the pope as proof of his commitment to combating heresy. 116

Once the "declaration" was ready, Morone and Beccadelli "by common agreement" ordered Pergola "to return to preach at Modena in conformity with it and, by his own living voice, either excuse himself, explain himself, or even retract according to need," as reads the somewhat tortuous formula with which the cardinal informed Sigibaldi on June 14. Besides giving the vicar precise instructions about the procedure and the people who should attend - among them, he hoped, Governor Francesco Villa and the inquisitor Fra Michele della Coltre, who could not in fact be present because he had been summoned to Rome as a witness, as well as Pietro Bertano, then bishop of Fano - Morone assured him that the friar had no intention "of being a heretic and was ready to do everything written above." 117

This is not the place to dwell upon the text of the recantation, 118 which Pergola refused to equate with an abjuration, declaring that "it was not a retraction but a declaration." 119 The ceremony took place in two sessions, on June 15 and 16. From the cathedral pulpit the friar read the forty articles agreed at Bologna, in the presence of all the principal city magistrates and a large crowd - more than three thousand people in Lancillotti's estimate - who had "come to the sermon more to see and hear new things than out of devotion." 120 A notary drew up a record of everything as a public act, and it was sent to Rome after being signed by numerous witnesses, including long-standing heterodox figures such as Bonifacio Valentini, Bartolomeo Grillenzoni, and Giovanni Rangoni. 121

At the end - the chronicler continued - the written articles he held in his hand fell from the pulpit, or else he threw them away almost as though enraged; and as a sign of this he was angry, sweating all over, with a hoarse and indeed almost trembling voice. How this business will proceed in the future will be better understood later. For my part, I believe he will not so quickly free himself from the Inquisition as perhaps he would wish, for his broad manner of preaching has badly edified this whole city.

Another chronicler likewise remarked how strained and evasive Pergola's interminable discourse had been, observing that the friar had retracted with his mouth - or rather, as heretics habitually do, had explained away a large part of the charges against him. 122 He was explicit in "complaining of those who had testified

against him and praying that God would one day reveal them." 123 The Academicians immediately celebrated the episode as a great success. On June 15 the Este governor informed the duke that Pergola, far from retracting, had so thoroughly "satisfied everyone by clearly explaining his meaning to them that he departed leaving everyone content." He also sent the news to Morone and to the minister general of the Conventual Franciscans.

It was probably on the basis of these reports that the Ferrarese resident at Bologna, after discussing the matter with the cardinal, advised Ercole II to write to Rome "for the benefit of the said friar, who had been falsely accused." On June 16 Count Ercole Rangoni spoke in the Council of Conservators to defend Pergola, who, after being unjustly slandered, had vindicated himself in a fully Catholic manner, and urged his colleagues to write in this sense to Morone. On the seventeenth a certain Giovanni Villanova began going through the city "with a sheet of paper containing a poorly dictated and still worse written petition in favor of the aforesaid preacher, signed on his behalf by many gentlemen, citizens, and religious of that faction, including those of the Academy, […] people without understanding," Lancillotti commented. 124

This certainly did not please Morone, who thus found himself against his will aligned with the Modenese heterodox, a still living and vigorous group whose exultation did little to support Pergola's Catholic orthodoxy. As often happened, Lancillotti saw the matter clearly. He refused to sign the petition and preferred to refrain from rash predictions about how the affair would end.

4. Roman Echoes: Morone under Accusation

Later the Milanese cardinal would try to diminish the significance of the incident, stating almost casually in his *confessio* that he had been informed that Pergola had previously preached "with a good reputation" at Rome. Yet as soon as the vicar warned him that "this father was highly suspect and had said many things that were not proper," he recalled him to Bologna and, in agreement with the inquisitor, sent him back to Modena so that "in two or three sermons he might explain himself and retract point by point. […] The father was afterward punished by his own order; I know nothing else about it." 125 Several witnesses, however, would flatly contradict him, beginning with Pergola himself.

The case was far from closed, despite Priuli's satisfaction on June 23, based on information received from Morone, that "the preacher's affairs are so well directed toward the peace of that city." 126 In reality all optimism was entirely unfounded. After reporting to the cardinal on his Modenese "declaration" and "taking leave," the friar had to set out for Rome and appear before the Holy Office, which evidently had no intention of closing the incident by leaving it to Morone alone. As evidence of the importance attached to his case, he was questioned in person by Gian Pietro Carafa and Juan Álvarez de Toledo, the leaders of the tribunal, to whom he would confess that he had given evasive answers.

What deserves emphasis is that these interrogations took place in the wholly unusual setting of the private home of friends of Cardinal Toledo, without any written record being made. For the moment, therefore, they were intended only to supply information considered useful by the leaders of the Holy Office, while remaining secret, entrusted to the personal memory of the two cardinals rather than to the formal memory of archival documents and the institutional procedures those documents imposed, including the obligation to report them to the pope. The two cardinals merely ordered the Franciscan preacher to return to Bologna and wait until he was sent the text he was to read from the pulpit at Modena in order to abjure his heresies. 127 He, in fact, was not the tribunal's principal target, which already at that

date had clearly adopted a strategy aimed at compiling genuine dossiers on eminent prelates, above all potential candidates for the tiara - a strategy that would emerge fully into the open during the conclave of 1549 and the first years of Julius III's pontificate. 128 After a brief imprisonment, Pergola was therefore able to return to Bologna, where he arrived toward the end of October to await the instructions promised by the Holy Office. In fact, those instructions never came, although he appeared before the inquisitor several times to press for a decision. Nor did anything come of his decision to go to a notary on October 31, 1544, to draw up "a formal protest," as he would later say, "so that the time granted me in Rome to go to Modena and explain myself should not expire."

It was probably then, immediately after his return from Rome, that Pergola decided to burn some heretical books in his possession, including Johannes Brenz's commentaries on the Gospels, which he had bought in Antonio Gadaldino's shop in Modena. He also had occasion to meet again with figures such as Andrea Ghetti, Ludovico Castelvetro, and Giovan Battista Scotti, who emerged from their conversations "firmly and clearly" convinced that the friar was a Lutheran. 129 After asking about his Roman ordeal and learning that the supreme inquisitors wanted him to return to Modena to retract three propositions - "on predestination, on works performed for one's own interest, and on wearing little written charms on one's person" - the cardinal observed that these were "true things: namely, that the predestined cannot be damned; that man should not do good for his own advantage but for the honor of God and in obedience to His commandments; and that carrying these little charms was a superstition." When he learned that the minister general of the order did not want the friar to return to his convent, Morone reached the height of imprudence by promising Pergola, as the latter would later reveal, to help him should he decide to "leave Italy." His conduct was identical to that of the Modenese heterodox, who offered to introduce the friar to a man "who had clothes, money, and horses there for going out of Italy," to accompany him on the journey, and to guarantee him material support once he had crossed the Alps. 130

We do not know how the affair ended. In any event, what has been said thus far makes clear both the complicity Morone extended to Pergola and the cardinal's naivety - astonishing, to say the least, in a diplomat of his caliber - in exposing himself so rashly to criticism, suspicion, and accusation, and in trusting those he helped, some of whom would later return to the Catholic faith and be ready to tell everything they knew in order to escape a severe sentence. Pergola seems to have received only light penalties and to have been forbidden to preach for a time, although Cervini still distrusted him in October 1545. 131 In 1549 the cardinal of Santa Croce received information that prompted him to reopen the investigation, but he was soon told that Golfi, after having "suffered greatly" in the past "on account of heresy," was generally regarded as "a good man" in the convent at Pergola and "lived with all the submission and respect appropriate to Catholic matters and the Roman Church." 132 On that occasion Cervini sent him his *Instructio ad praedicatores*, 133 while as late as 1553-54 Girolamo Muzio and the duke of Urbino were trying to secure his complete rehabilitation. 134 In February 1556 he voluntarily appeared before the Roman Holy Office "to ask permission […] to preach and to unburden his conscience," but on April 9 the inquisitors once again confined him in the prison of Ripetta, where he still remained at the end of the following year after testifying against Morone. On May 1, 1560, the town of Pergola was assigned to him as his prison, and on June 4 he was ordered to wear the penitential garment for two weeks and attend Mass every day in the principal church. The absolution decreed by Cardinal Carpi came only in January 1562, 135 and shortly afterward Pergola was able to participate as a theologian at the Council of Trent, where he opposed granting the chalice to the laity. 136

It may have been in connection with the Pergola affair that Giacomo Giacomelli, bishop of Belcastro and brother of the pope's personal physician, spoke with Pope Farnese about Morone's views "concerning justification and grace and similar matters," attributing his erroneous opinions solely to "great ignorance." At this Paul III "slapped his hand upon his knee and said, 'Bishop, you have indeed spoken a great truth.'" 137 Also in 1544, in Rome, Cardinal Gregorio Cortese told Bishop Scipione Bongalli of the malicious rumors that both he and Morone were "heretics," although the accusations seemed so absurd to him that he "burst out laughing." 138 The fact that, through Cardinal Badia, Morone asked Paul III - and on April 20, 1545,

obtained - the power to authorize anyone in his diocese to absolve in confession “all those who had incurred excommunication for any Lutheran matters or for any other heresies whatsoever” 139 seems to indicate his determination to continue along the path of mildness, also in order to prevent interventions by the Holy Office in his diocese, where, as we have seen, he himself had given rise to suspicions and accusations. Yet it was precisely on this mined terrain that the year 1545 brought a turning point in which Morone was personally involved.

It was then that the conviction that he “favored Lutherans” began to spread among many Dominicans, even outside Modena. 140 It was also then that the famous anti-Lutheran controversialist Ambrogio Catarino Politi - no doubt after Salmeron’s return to Rome, to whom he was closely attached - addressed a letter to the Catholics of Modena, urging them to remain steadfast in their faith against the Lutherans, from whom they suffered insults and abuse. 141 This accusation therefore directly implicated Morone. It was similar and contemporary to that leveled by another friar, the Spanish Franciscan Juan de Meneses, whose sermons in the cathedral at the beginning of May had aroused the misgivings of the ever-suspicious Lancillotti. “His sermons seem to please the Academy and many others of that class,” he noted on the seventh, “because he says that our works are of no benefit and other things that allow people to live freely.” He called on God to help “with this heresy that now reigns, although I hope it will soon be settled by the council begun at Trent.” Three days later, however, he had to acknowledge that the friar’s true position was very different: Meneses had finally “taken off his mask, having said that all those who do not believe that the pope was appointed by God, and likewise that the constitutions and ordinances of the Church were so established, are not true Christians but false ones, and that their Christ is the devil. At this those Academicians turned up their noses, calling him a drunken madman, together with other disgraceful words.” The situation was therefore again deteriorating, to the point that no sermon was preached on the fourteenth, “because every scoundrel wants to lay down the law for the preachers who come there to spread the word of God,” the Modenese chronicler lamented, wounded in his civic pride by the fact that “outside this city people say that we are all Lutherans.” 142

That very day Meneses sent Duke Ercole II a bitter denunciation in which he also implicated Morone and laid heavy responsibility upon him. After praising the ancient Catholic tradition of the Este dynasty, he presented himself as an indefatigable preacher of the Gospel throughout the world who, on finally arriving in Modena, had found heresies and heretics so pestilential that they surpassed all Germans in the obstinacy and impudence with which they spread their errors. It was a dramatic alarm, denouncing the clandestine printing of heretical books in a city where the Academy was depicted as a veritable tower of Babel rising ever higher. Since the word of God that he preached had begun to defeat those proud heretics and disrupt their relations with the German heresiarchs, the Catholics had asked Morone to keep him in Modena, while the heterodox had pressed for his removal and ultimately obtained the bishop’s support. The accusation could hardly have been more explicit, for it did not merely deplore the bishop’s inadequate attention to an exceedingly serious problem but went so far as to define him as the chief obstacle to preserving the true faith. Meneses therefore appealed to the duke to take drastic action to dismantle the heretical networks, holding out before him, among other things, the considerable wealth he might seize, but also warning him that, should he do nothing, the friar would turn to the pope and the emperor.

There is no evidence that Morone ever learned of this letter, which has survived in the archive of the local Inquisition. It probably contributed to the duke’s decision - his royal wife herself caused him no little trouble with the rigorous Calvinism professed in her small court 143 - to publish on May 24, 1545, a severe *Provision […] concerning Matters of the Christian Faith*, followed by a letter to the vicar on June 9. 144 Lancillotti inserted a summary of the proclamation in his chronicle. It prohibited the possession of heretical books and writings and gave their owners until the end of June “to repent and burn the books”; after that date suspect houses would be searched and offenders subjected to severe penalties. 145 Meanwhile, in a coincidence of timing difficult to regard as accidental, Paul III, informed that in Modena “Lutheran heresy has increased and grows and spreads more each day,” signed a brief on May 28 ordering the arrest of Filippo

Valentini. He nevertheless managed to flee, returning to his native city several years later and privately submitting to the bishop. 146

Vittore Soranzo was encountering still greater difficulties in those same years at Bergamo, where his vigorous but equally imprudent program of reform finally led to his summons to Rome in 1551. 147 Until then, convinced that the Republic of Venice would always be able to defend him, he had paid too little attention to the warnings of the storm gathering over his head, to the enmities, protests, and reprimands aroused by his pastoral activity, which threatened to engulf the entire group of the *spirituali*. That group was being forced ever more tightly into a corner by the strengthening of the Inquisition, the worsening conflict between Charles V and Paul III, the exhaustion of every irenic prospect with the Protestant world, and the formulation of the Tridentine decrees in terms that relegated Valdesian doctrines to the realm of heresy. It was Morone himself who warned Soranzo of the inquisitorial discontent directed against him and advised greater caution. His warning, however, went unheeded, as is clear from the deferential letter Soranzo sent him on August 15, 1547: 148

My people here in Rome have warned me in the name of Your Most Reverend Lordship of certain accusations made against me as a suspect, and admonished me to take care not to give rise to such unfavorable suspicion in the future. First of all, I accept with all reverence your holy admonition, full of charity. I further affirm that I am not conscious of ever having taught, either in private or in public discourse, anything except Catholic doctrine conforming to the determinations of the Church. As for favoring suspicious persons, because I am bishop here many people, both my own subjects and foreigners, come to me for assistance and help in their needs, and I willingly help all of them insofar as I can. But I expressly deny that I have knowingly done so for persons infamous for heresy. As for guarding myself in the future, I say that I have done so in the past; indeed, for defending the jurisdiction of the Church I came close last year to being carried off from Venice itself. In the future, all the more after being admonished by you, I shall strive not to give off a bad odor but rather to make myself known as a good and devoted servant of His Holiness - provided that this is enough to silence these friars who are my enemies. The causes of their enmity are the same as those behind the hatred they bear all other resident prelates who wish in some measure to perform their duty. Such prelates cannot be tolerated by licentious and superstitious religious, who, as they have done in the past, would like to enjoy themselves and, presenting themselves as holy and learned, govern the bishop and the people. Whenever they see a prelate capable of rebuking their filthy lives and superstitious ignorance, they try to remove him so that they may remain masters of the field.

It is significant that Morone later included this letter among the documents for his defense, as evidence of his commitment to the struggle against heresy and of his distancing himself from the *spirituali*. In fact, the Pergola affair had burned him. It made clear not only the risks involved in indulging certain doctrines and favoring certain individuals, but also that neither his personal prestige nor the purple he wore could shelter him from the Holy Office. “Heresies are increasing chiefly because of preachers, who truly are destroyers,” a fierce anti-Lutheran, the Dominican Tommaso Stella, wrote from Bologna to Marcello Cervini on September 17, 1548, 149 perhaps echoing concerns heard from Morone’s own lips. The cardinal was forced to remain away from Modena and therefore could not hear the friars he selected for the Advent and Lenten cycles. We do not know, for example, what the Franciscan Francesco da Meda preached in May 1544, one month before Pergola’s retraction. He does not appear to have been involved in any inquisitorial incident, but Sigibaldi’s reports must have been disturbing enough for the cardinal to reply in exasperation: 150

By now I no longer know how to manage these friars, especially in their preaching, because I would not wish, in trying to do good, to achieve the opposite. Many worthy persons gave me favorable reports of Pergola before I sent him to Modena; afterward you know what happened. […] For these reasons I am in continual fear of sending preachers to Modena and, if I could avoid sending one even for Lent, knowing the cunning of these preachers, I would not send him - all the more so if you or I could discharge this office ourselves.

From then on his conduct changed. He sought to avoid choices that might arouse suspicion and indeed to act in such a way as to present himself as a champion of Catholic orthodoxy. Perhaps he realized that his lack

of theological expertise risked drawing him onto a mined field. Perhaps he quickly understood the sterility and political defeat of that vague “spiritual conversation” into which Flaminio and Pole had drawn him at Trent. 151 Perhaps the intense religious aspirations breathed by Valdesian doctrine were too far removed from his pragmatic temperament to put down firm roots within him. In any case, he was among the first to understand the direction of the wind blowing in Rome and to draw the consequences. This was certainly not opportunism, which was foreign to his character, but the lucid realism that from childhood had taught him to speak the concrete language of the possible and not to lose himself in the mists of Nicodemism and prophetic expectation.

His immersion in affairs, in the concrete reality of acting and accomplishing - as the immediate pastoral consequences of his new religious identity themselves demonstrate - was likewise very far from Valdés’s and Flaminio’s reflective temperament and radical spiritualism. It was equally distant from the elusive silences and hidden secrets that Pole - truly a “Saint Patrick’s well” to the end of his days - seemed to conceal in the depths of his heart, yet which nevertheless broke through even the Milanese cardinal’s disenchanted pragmatism and left an indelible mark upon him. Morone’s militancy in the camp of the *spirituali* therefore lasted only two years, although it was embraced with an enthusiasm as ardent as it was incautious; but those two years weighed forever upon the long life still awaiting him. This did not mean, of course, that he abandoned either his friendship with the English cardinal or his irenic orientation, but only that, for the moment, he proceeded with greater caution. This is what the documents suggest. Beyond that, into the labyrinths of his conscience, the historian cannot venture.

5. “They Must Be Helped with Charity”

That his relations with the “company” gathered around Pole did not change is attested by the surviving correspondence between Priuli and Morone, which reveals the English cardinal’s desire to influence the selection of preachers to be sent to Modena. On May 3, 1544, for example, the Venetian patrician recommended to him the minister general of the Minims, the Calabrian Gaspare Ricciulli dal Fosso, then almost fifty years old, as “a person of good spirit and good and Catholic doctrine, insofar as I am informed by our Messer Apollonio [Merenda], who has known him closely for a long time.” A week later he again wrote about Ricciulli’s “holy conversation,” from which Morone might receive “no small consolation,” and even suggested appointing him suffragan: “In this way, in addition to the other advantages Your Most Reverend Lordship might have for the service of your church, you would be freed from the continual burden of having to provide preachers every year, a matter so difficult, troublesome, and dangerous.” 152 That this was an attempt to repeat what had previously happened with Bartoli 153 - that is, to orient pastoral teaching in his diocese in a Valdesian direction - is suggested by the simultaneous dispatch to Morone of twenty gatherings of an unidentified work revised by Pole, copies of which were also sent at the same time to Colonna and Soranzo. A month later, when Ricciulli had already arrived in Bologna, the bishop of Bergamo recommended him to Giovan Battista Scotti, presenting him as a man “very pious and a good religious, and beloved by me. It would please me, and I am certain would console you, if you visited him in my name.” 154

Ricciulli would be made bishop of Scala in 1546 and would participate actively in the final phase of the council, ending his days in 1596 as bishop of Reggio Calabria with the reputation of an austere prelate zealous in applying the Tridentine reforms. Yet it is clear that in the early 1540s his religious orientation was in harmony with that of the *spirituali*, and it cannot be excluded that he himself had passed through a Valdesian experience. He was certainly a great admirer of Ochino, whose flight he justified “by saying that he had not done it with an evil intention, but from fear of death, which Christ and then many saints also feared.” 155 On June 11 Priuli again pressed Morone, proposing, in full agreement with Pole, that Ricciulli be sent to preach Lent in Modena “in order to test both the grace of God in him in such a ministry and the disposition and readiness of that city to accept him.” He then learned, however, that the cardinal “had already intended and was trying to secure that father for this Lent, unless his prior assignment to preach at Palermo prevented it.” 156 Finally, on the twenty-third, writing to Beccadelli, Priuli asked him to watch over

Morone's health and see "that he does not overexert himself," while expressing satisfaction that "affairs were beginning to move forward and allow him to breathe a little" - a clear reference to the Pergola affair. 157

It is precisely in the pastoral government of the diocese of Modena that the first signs can be seen of a different way of acting - more than of thinking - on Morone's part. He himself would later point to this when recalling that, after Salmeron's expulsion, he sent the Mantuan Dominican Reginaldo Nerli to Modena to preach to the people and explain Scripture, a task to which Nerli devoted himself for a long time. 158 In reality, this did not happen immediately after the incident with the Spanish Jesuit, but a year later, in the wake of Pergola's retraction. Morone passed over the latter episode in silence so that the appointment of the new preacher would not appear dictated by expediency. Then about fifty years old, Nerli was a man of lucid and passionate faith, 159 who had entered the convent at a very young age and later worked with Giberti at Verona for eleven years. 160 There in 1537 he publicly commented on Saint Paul's epistles, 161 while warning Ercole Gonzaga not to appoint his Modenese confrere Pietro Bertano bishop of Fano, accusing him of being "the ruin of the order," a "great scoundrel" who had "no more religion than a Jew and no more conscience than a dog." The cardinal of Mantua resented these words, although he attributed them only to Nerli's "simplicity": the friar "would like that fine festival he began there in Verona to continue all day long, with the common people going about preaching predestination and crying 'Christ, Christ' through the streets with the crucifix in their hands." These words eloquently reveal the religious and pastoral zeal that would later lead Gonzaga to seek the collaboration of that "father […] most dear in Christ," as he called him in 1546. 162 Nerli's familiarity with Giberti is also confirmed by the fact that it was he who wrote down the bishop's will from dictation at Verona. There in 1542, after a period spent at Bologna as *magister studentium* in the Dominican studium, he was among the first readers of the *Benefit of Christ*, "before it was printed." Like Contarini, 163 he judged it a dangerous book and pointed out its heresies to the bishop, who instead believed "that it was a good thing" and commissioned Nerli to write a censorship of it. 164

Morone met Nerli in Bologna, and it is not known whether or when someone introduced the friar to him as a man both theologically reliable and animated by great fervor - perhaps Pole, with whom the Mantuan Dominican claimed to have "great familiarity." 165 Before the inquisitors Nerli would state that the new legate, as soon as he learned of his presence in the city, summoned him and told him that he had long "loved him dearly." Morone repeatedly expressed the wish that Nerli should succeed him in the episcopal see - something the friar said he would accept only if "compelled by His Holiness" - and finally succeeded in having the order's superiors send him to preach in Modena. It was probably during these conversations, no doubt in order to test Nerli's religious orientation - firmly orthodox, yet imbued with a mysticism in some respects similar to Valdesian spiritualism (Nerli would end his days as a passionate reader of Johannes Tauler) - that the friar read to the cardinal a now-lost short work by Vittoria Colonna addressed to Alvise Priuli. In his judgment it was written "in a very Catholic manner," although perhaps not entirely devoid of allusive doctrinal inflections. 166

At Modena the Mantuan friar preached and commented continuously on Holy Scripture during the twenty months he lived there, without ever encountering "anger or disturbing words" from the bishop. 167 Modenese sources confirm that in 1545 he delivered the Lenten sermons "to an appreciative audience," after which Morone commissioned him to visit every church in the diocese. "And so he did with the greatest diligence and reported to His Lordship," Lancillotti noted, emphasizing that it was precisely from this visitation that the synod convoked in 1546 "to the praise of God" arose. 168 Between March and April that tall, gaunt friar, 169 "a good man," was the only preacher in the city, in order to prevent the recurrence of doctrinal disputes and rivalries between the religious orders, as had happened in the past. 170 Yet the Modenese chronicler could not refrain from recording that popular interest soon evaporated, despite the bishop's expectations, leaving Nerli with "a very small audience because his voice is very weak." 171 That year Nerli also assumed the office of deputy to the inquisitor. 172 It was perhaps for this reason that Morone, while passing through Modena, entrusted him with the task of drawing up a kind of inventory of the heresies contained in Konrad Pellikan's *Commentaria Bibliorum*. After a few days, however, that "most excellent,

learned Catholic" withdrew from the undertaking, saying "that he did not have the courage to finish it, because the volumes were large and full of heresies." 173

Esteemed by many Modenese, who would remember him as a man "of good reputation and regarded as good, learned, and Catholic," committed to combating heresy both through preaching and through visitations, 174 Nerli would be questioned by the Roman Holy Office about Morone, but he disappointed the tribunal's expectations. 175 He offered a positive portrait of the Milanese cardinal, "a very good Christian and prelate," with whom he remained bound until death by mutual esteem and personal friendship. He praised Morone's virtues and pastoral commitment, with the sole exception of his insufficient zeal in repressing heresy. 176 This was despite the fact that Nerli had given him the names of suspect clerics discovered during the visitation - foremost among them that "great Lutheran" Bonifacio Valentini and his cousin Filippo - men so notorious in the city that the bishop could not have been unaware of them. "I never saw any other measure taken either by His Most Reverend Lordship or by anyone else," Nerli would declare. 177 In his judgment, the conviction among many Modenese, including numerous Dominicans, that their bishop "was a Lutheran" arose precisely because "after many complaints had been made to His Most Reverend Lordship, he took no action, while all the while that great heretical plague, of which the whole city was full, continued to grow." Some even said that "he seemed to caress the Lutherans more than the Catholics," and that the "Lutherans boasted that their cardinal-bishop belonged to their party." 178 When Nerli tried to discuss the matter with him face to face, the only response he received was an exhortation to "preach and lecture with sound doctrine, for in that way those poor deceived people would be helped." Thus, although Morone had distanced himself from the *spirituali*, he did not abandon his strategy of moderation, persuasion, and dialogue. The pastoral tasks assigned to Nerli formed part of that strategy. To support him, one morning Morone summoned the cathedral canons and told them that he had "sent this friar to preach and lecture in this city because I hold him to be Catholic and of sound doctrine according to the Holy Church, and I do not want anyone other than him to preach or lecture on the Scriptures in this church. […] Be content to listen to him and believe him as though you were listening to me and believing me myself." Yet when once again warned of "the great multitude of heretics" present in Modena, he urged Nerli to help them with "moderation" and "charity," leading the friar once more to believe that Morone's failure to act severely arose from "his excessively humane and benign nature." 179

Despite everything that had happened in his own personal experience, Morone's words ultimately expressed the same principle that had guided him ten years earlier, at the beginning of his nunciatures in Germany. 180 When he told Nerli to "explain clearly the teachings of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, but with charity and moderation," 181 he did nothing other than restate the Valdesian demand to abstain from all polemic and controversy. It cannot be excluded that this very disagreement lay behind the obscure reasons that brought the collaboration between the Mantuan friar and Morone to an end in 1546, probably at the latter's initiative, although the two maintained cordial personal relations. On August 16 of that year Nerli was in Milan, from where he informed the cardinal of his intention to go "into many lands of the Swiss and Grisons in support of the most holy faith," even though he would have preferred to remain in Modena, "all the more because I am informed from there that things have begun to decline, especially in the city." 182

We know little about the preachers who followed Nerli in the pulpits of Modena. On December 13, 1544, shortly after Nerli's arrival, Morone expressed satisfaction to the vicar that the guardian of the Franciscan convent, Giovanni Francesco da Pontremoli, was delivering "an occasional sermon" in the cathedral, "exhorting the people above all to good works and charity, which I understand has grown very cold in that city, where no alms at all are any longer given." Lancillotti, however, noted that in his sermons the friar had said, among other things, "that justified Christians are justified by the blood of Christ and not by their works." 183 This prompted the intervention of the inquisitor Angelo Valentini, who publicly disputed with him amid "great contention, one in the pulpit and the other at the altar, so that they took up the books and gave the listeners much to laugh at" while arguing about Saint Thomas, "and thus many words were exchanged." Tried for heresy, the friar was condemned. 184 The embarrassments created by preachers would therefore continue for a long time, with growing annoyance on the bishop's part. In mid-December 1546, for

example, he had still done nothing to find a worthy preacher for the now imminent Lent. 185 We do not know what he meant when, in a letter sent from Rome to Ercole Gonzaga on April 3 of that year, he complained of unspecified rumors about him spread by certain Lateran Canons Regular, whose protector was the cardinal of Mantua. 186 In 1547 the Dominican Girolamo da Casale preached in the cathedral, again without competitors in the other churches, unlike in the past,

when, Lancillotti wrote, preaching was heard in all the large churches of Modena, and even in the houses of Modena Holy Scripture was read aloud. The great men of the city and many common people went there, and they interpreted the sayings of the holy doctors of the Church in a bad sense; for this reason one party went one way and another the other, creating schism in the city and even coming to blows. The cause of it all was certain Lutheranizers who introduced Holy Scripture in the vernacular so that the coarse and ignorant might learn. It was all done maliciously in order to deprive the religious of the revenues of their benefices, but they did not succeed, unless the council should do it. 187

In 1547 and again the following year the cathedral pulpit was entrusted to another Dominican, the sixty-year-old Santo da Mantova, “a good and learned man,” 188 while the Lent of 1549 was preached “to the most appreciative audience of more than two thousand persons” by the Augustinian Bonforte da Pavia, in the presence of the Este duke and the governor. Once again he alone mounted the pulpit “so that no schism might arise,” Lancillotti complained on the first day of Lent, 189 thereby attesting to the persistence of strong religious tensions, which were also reflected in conduct disrespectful of sacred liturgies. On April 22, 1549, the governor of Modena - the civil authority, it must be stressed, not the religious one - issued a proclamation forbidding people “to walk about the churches while the offices are being celebrated, […] at the request of the reverend father preacher” as he took leave of the city, “having greatly satisfied the people.” For a time at least, the edict appears to have been observed, “so that all the churches looked like holy temples, with people standing quietly; whereas when they used to walk about, they looked like houses of the devil and like hornets buzzing through the churches. Everyone did this, but most of all the foolish, ill-mannered, badly brought-up young men.” 190

In his sermons Bonforte da Pavia dwelt chiefly on charity, works, and the desirability of holding a procession “to make a good collection for the poor.” This time poor Sigibaldi could finally breathe freely, since the inquisitor would have no reason to “find fault” with those “most useful sermons,” he wrote Morone on April 13. He suggested asking that the Augustinian be appointed prior of the city convent “so that on feast days during the year he might sometimes preach and confirm in sound doctrine those who stray.” The cardinal replied by lamenting the truly Sisyphean labor involved in finding “a preacher who satisfies those people,” but encouraged the vicar to defend the friar from slander if he continued to offer “sound doctrine with the proper zeal for the salvation of that people.” 191 Antonio Fiordibello and Canon Gaspare da Lino congratulated Morone on the excellent choice of preacher, who had “satisfied this whole city universally as much as can be said,” as shown by the fact that not only the duke but also “many of our people from the Academy” wished to confess and receive communion from him. 192 For his part, the bishop seems to have learned the lesson: none of the friars who preached in Modena during the second half of the 1540s had any further trouble with the Holy Office.

Chapter Eight

“He Found the Means to Punish the Wicked and the Gluttons”: The Legation of Bologna

1. Governing the City

Bologna had more than once formed the backdrop to important events in Giovanni Morone’s life. Here in 1530, in the entourage of Clement VII, he had witnessed the solemn coronation of Charles V while his father died on the road to the city, where he had hoped to embrace his son once more and meet the emperor. 1 It was then that control of the family passed into the hands of the twenty-one-year-old bishop of Modena. Francesco II Sforza, also present in Bologna, invited him to lunch at the palace where he was staying. Besides being a gesture of courtesy, this was undoubtedly a way of testing the young man’s opinions and judgment immediately after the death of the grand chancellor, and the impression he made could hardly have been more favorable. “I believe Monsignor Morone is a saint,” Sforza reportedly said, “nor have I ever seen a young man more modest, wiser, better, or more Catholic than he,” as though transferring to the son the high esteem he had felt for the father. He would soon make use of him, “sending him now as nuncio or ambassador to the Holy See in the time of Paul III, now to other lords on other business of his,” and would ask him to celebrate his marriage to Christina of Denmark on May 4, 1534. 2

Morone’s first ties with several distinguished Bolognese families also dated from those months, as did, no doubt, his first experience of the ineradicable local feuds, of which his friend Scipione Bottrigari became a victim in 1536. 3 He had returned to Bologna in 1532 for the second entry of Clement VII and Charles V, whose lengthy preparations he had followed from Rome on behalf of the duke of Milan. 4 The following year he had been ordained priest and consecrated bishop there in the church of San Francesco, staying in its convent before finally going to take possession of his diocese. Here in 1542 he received the cardinal’s hat and met frequently with Contarini during their joint effort to reduce the Modenese heterodox to obedience. 5

Morone’s appointment as legate of Bologna, Ravenna, and Romagna on April 2, 1544, approved by the consistory on the seventh, 6 was favorably received by the city’s governor, Bernardino Castellari. He expressed to Cardinal Farnese his satisfaction at the appointment of “a person so well qualified and of such worth and virtue that this city can truly expect nothing but excellent government.” Cardinal Del Monte, foreseeing a revival of municipal resistance precisely because of the new legate’s authority, told the Bolognese ambassador in Rome that he had “informed him from A to Z of everything.” Morone was “thoroughly instructed,” “understood every matter,” and was moreover so well disposed toward the Senate. 7 Sadoleto congratulated him, 8 and Gualteruzzi immediately wrote to Beccadelli in Bologna, evoking the previous legate, Contarini. 9 Alvise Priuli likewise referred to him soon afterward, expressing pleasure to Beccadelli that “each day that city will realize more fully that it has recovered the loss it suffered in the other man.” 10 Morone himself informed Beccadelli on April 5, hoping to count on his collaboration and knowing full well that the legation “is a great burden and not something over which to rejoice very much,” 11 no doubt remembering the countless troubles in which the Venetian cardinal had become entangled.

The new legate entered the city on May 5 “with the customary great pomp, joy, and consolation of the people,” 12 though without ostentation, as when he had taken possession of the diocese of Modena. Not everyone was pleased, however, and one chronicler observed that his coming was greeted “with little satisfaction,” partly because “he went to San Pietro and then to the palace.” 13 During their *joyeuses entrées*, papal legates habitually favored the cathedral of San Pietro over the basilica of San Petronio, 14 the medieval emblem of civic religion. One of the cathedral canons was struck by the intense religious faith the new legate displayed in kissing the cross - perhaps an echo of the spirituality in which he had been involved at Trent - “by this act of devotion giving rise to great expectations of himself, not only among the clergy but throughout the entire city.” 15

On taking office Morone found himself acting in a highly tense political climate, stirred by the persistent winds of war blowing across many parts of Europe and by the rapid deterioration of relations between pope and emperor. Sent to the Brussels court in November 1543, Alessandro Farnese failed to appease Charles V's anger. The emperor went so far as to threaten a new sack of Rome because the pope had failed to provide the promised military and financial support in the war against the Turk, who was again sweeping through Hungary. In response to the pragmatic sanction issued at the end of 1543, which reserved ecclesiastical benefices in Iberian territory to Spanish subjects alone, the pope issued an *Admonitio paterna* on April 2. In it he reproached the emperor for improperly intruding into ecclesiastical affairs and yielding to Lutheran demands, thereby prompting Calvin and Luther themselves to take the field in Charles V's defense. At the Diet of Speyer, convoked at the end of February 1544, pressing financial needs for the defense of the empire's southeastern frontier combined with hostility toward Pope Farnese to induce the Habsburg sovereign to grant generous concessions to the Protestants. Meanwhile, the continuing war against France made any new convocation of the council that had failed so miserably the previous year unthinkable. In August the armies of Charles V and Henry VIII advanced almost to Paris. The alliance between the Holy Roman Emperor and the heretic who had repudiated the emperor's aunt, Catherine of Aragon, was justified by the urgent need to oppose France, which in turn was allied with the leader of the infidels, the Ottoman sultan Suleiman the Magnificent. In May the Spanish ambassador was recalled from Rome, while the pope prepared to flood Germany with briefs condemning the recess of Speyer. 16

To ease a tension that threatened to drive him unreservedly into the arms of France, on July 30 Paul III entrusted Morone with a new legation to the emperor, while simultaneously sending Cardinal Marino Grimani to Paris to explore the possibility of peace. 17 Universally regarded as the foremost expert on the German world, Morone accepted, despite knowing that "this undertaking is most difficult" and that the journey, at his "now advancing age," would be "very laborious." So he wrote from Bologna to Alessandro Farnese on August 11, 1544, also pointing out that his financial circumstances were far from comfortable because of the large sums he had been forced to borrow in order to establish himself in the legation and doubted he could repay. But "having dedicated the years remaining to me first to the service of God and then to His Beatitude," he concluded, "I do not weigh this greatly: it is enough for me to obey promptly." 18 That, after all, was what he had done almost continuously between 1536 and 1542. He immediately set out to cross France, but had to turn back when Charles V informed him that he had no intention of receiving him. 19 The news reached him on September 14, when he had already arrived at Lyon, four days before the peace signed at Crépy brought the European war to an end. In later years the journey would allow several members of his household who accompanied him to recall his devotion when visiting the relic of Mary Magdalene kept at Saint-Jean-de-Maurienne, and his strict observance of Paul III's order to turn back, persuading Grimani likewise to obey at once. 20

Leaving Lyon on the fifteenth 21 to return to Italy, Morone could finally devote himself to the government of Bologna. Peace reopened the road to the council, which was indeed reconvoked at Trent in 1545 under the presidency of Marcello Cervini, Giovanni Maria Del Monte, and Reginald Pole. Morone welcomed and lodged the three legates in Bologna at the beginning of March as they traveled northward. 22 They would keep him regularly informed of the council's proceedings, just as he sent them his lucid political analyses, especially concerning imperial policy and the German world. 23 At the end of November Morone was summoned to Rome, where the pope wanted him at his side at that delicate moment, and he immediately set out. Then, informed that there was no urgency, he decided to remain in Bologna until Epiphany "and meanwhile to go as far as Modena and also to a place not far from Piacenza where my decrepit mother is, whom God knows whether I shall ever see again," he wrote Alessandro Farnese on December 2, 1544. 24

The "contractual" structure governing the Bolognese territory had been established in 1447, when the city returned to the Papal States after seventy years of rebellion and a kind of constitutional bilateralism was created between papal government and local autonomy. 25 The municipal statutes of the thirteenth century had introduced forms of political representation for the guilds and armed societies, exercised through the Council of the People and the magistracy of the Elders and consuls. In later centuries, however, the statutes

increasingly reflected the supremacy of papal jurisdiction over the communal institutions. This was sanctioned by the act of submission of 1360 and by the acceptance in 1377 of the apostolic legate's presence *intra moenia*. The statutes of 1454, which remained in force until French troops entered Bologna three and a half centuries later, fixed a structure of "'mixed government' divided in a hazy and precarious balance" among the legate, the sixteen Reformers of the State of Liberty, and the college of Elders and consuls. 26 The *supplicationes*, *capitulationes*, and *pacta* signed in the mid-fifteenth century between Nicholas V and Bolognese ambassadors, when the "republic" 27 was freed from Visconti rule, had nevertheless provided for power to be jointly vested in the civic magistracies and the legate, whose powers were still limited compared with those exercised in the following century. Among Bologna's magistracies, a preeminent role in safeguarding the remaining communal autonomies belonged to the *Reggimento*, or Senate, whose membership grew over time from the original Forty to about fifty. Every two months eight Elders and a gonfalonier, head of the Senate, were elected from within it; together with the legate, the gonfalonier signed the proclamations. Already in the fifteenth century, however, the popes disregarded the rule requiring consultation between the urban magistracies and the Roman curia in appointing the legate. The progressive clericalization of the administrative apparatus and the Roman centralization of the most important decisions, exercised also through the appointment of governors and auditors, imposed upon Bologna a succession of prelates who combined episcopal and legatine office. They were almost always outsiders to the local nobility and therefore beyond the influence of the Bentivoglio, the city's former lords.

After the failure of the Borgia attempt to create a dynastic state in the region, the remaining space for risky popular adventures was closed by Julius II's conquest and the creation of a Senate composed of local magnates appointed for life by the pope. In this way he secured the urban oligarchy's consent to the papal supremacy established between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. 28 This political process was definitively consolidated under Bologna's last lay governor, Francesco Guicciardini, between 1531 and 1534. Guicciardini also served as vice-legate to Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo, who held the office from 1524 to 1535 and whose government marked a decisive strengthening of legatine powers. A nephew of Innocent VIII and Lorenzo the Magnificent, the rich and powerful cardinal received from Clement VII extremely broad faculties, enabling him to intervene in both temporal and spiritual affairs: from governing monasteries and convents to conferring benefices even in the most important institutions, such as collegiate churches and cathedrals; from granting indulgences to visiting and correcting exempt and non-exempt churches and pious places; from ecclesiastical courts to admission to holy orders in canonically exceptional cases; and from interventions in sacred buildings to new foundations even without the ordinary's consent. Paul III then brought about the final turn in relations between Rome and Bologna, confining civic institutions to an administrative role and curbing their capacity to express autonomous positions. Rome's dispatch to Bologna of increasingly authoritative members of the Sacred College - Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora, the pope's nephew, 29 Gasparo Contarini, Giovanni Morone, and Giovanni Maria Del Monte - plainly demonstrated its diminishing regard for civic autonomy. 30 Petitions submitted by popular ambassadors during the pope's visits to the city, concerning the widest variety of administrative matters, received replies drafted by the legate and, when answers came from Rome, invariably referred the questions back to his decision. 31

The absenteeism of the diocesan ordinaries also strengthened legatine power. Bishop Alessandro Campeggi - who succeeded his father, Cardinal Lorenzo - was appointed by Clement VII with right of succession in 1526 but was not consecrated until 1541. As vice-legate of Avignon, he governed the diocese through his vicar and suffragan Agostino Zanetti, titular bishop of Sebaste, and resided in Bologna only during the transfer of the council. During that period one of the assembly's presidents, the future pope Giovanni Maria Del Monte, took up residence in his palace, where the commissions also met, while solemn sessions were held in the basilica of San Petronio. 32 Made a cardinal in 1551, Alessandro Campeggi retained the title of the diocese until the following year, when he transferred it to his cousin Giovanni. The Tridentine provisions designed to strengthen the figure of the bishop, even at the expense of papal power and its representatives such as the legates, were themselves widely disregarded. 33 By virtue of canon law and the broad powers assigned to him, the legate acted "in his province" in the pope's stead and occupied a

position of absolute supremacy over all other temporal and spiritual authorities, including the bishop, as indeed prescribed in Pietro Andrea Gambaro's nearly contemporary treatise *De officio atque auctoritate legati a latere*. 34

The appointment of so authoritative a figure as Morone could therefore only alarm the civic patriciate and the Senate itself, which embodied a historic governing compromise increasingly tilted in Rome's favor. Moreover, Morone not only received confirmation of the enormous powers already held by Cibo but was granted new authority to derogate from the provisions of episcopal synods, municipal ordinances and constitutions, rules of the papal chancery, every kind of statute, custom, privilege, and indult, as well as apostolic letters. 35 The day after his installation, the new legate performed the traditional ceremony of presenting his faculties to the *Reggimento*, but it is highly probable that, like other legates before him, he kept silent about prerogatives likely to arouse adverse reactions, reserving the right to publish them when necessary. 36 Morone himself would say that he enjoyed "the broadest faculties" in all his legations. 37 According to Giovanni Boccadiferro, his Bolognese *procancellarius*, he exercised "both powers, that is, spiritual and temporal, performing many spiritual acts, issuing letters of favor and justice, conferring benefices, granting indulgences, admitting to holy orders, and consecrating," as occurred on April 3, 1548, when Pompeo Zambeccari was invested as bishop of Sulmona. 38

Some indication of the underlying tension always present between the representative of papal power and the civic government, committed to defending its autonomy and ancient privileges, is offered by the endemic disputes over precedence. One such incident occurred during the Good Friday rite in San Petronio, when the Gonfalonier of Justice and the Elders attempted to break the tradition by which the canons preceded them in the adoration of the cross, placing themselves instead at the head of the procession. Morone did not protest. He decided to lead the group of religious who had been pushed back, telling them that "if the Lord Gonfalonier had shown such arrogance and pride as to wish to be first, he should be allowed to do so, since one had to go to such an act of adoration with humility and reverence, not with pride. […] And it was then said that this had been a very Catholic and honorable act." 39 Far from being a sign of weakness, his formal recognition of their dignity cannot have reassured the senators. Morone's power in the curia was well known to them, as also shown by his appointment in mid-November to the new congregation on the council. 40 Only two days later Giovanni Campeggi, bishop of Parenzo, cousin of the ordinary of Bologna and resident in Rome, where he managed the affairs of a family in rapid economic and social ascent, informed the *Reggimento* that from that point onward the ancient *Constitutiones Aegidianae*, with their dreaded criminal penalty of confiscation, would also be applied in Bologna. The senators could do no more than warn their ambassador in Rome that the measure violated their exemption from the constitutions of the Marches. 41 The almost unlimited autonomy enjoyed by the legate did not, however, guarantee his independence from papal decisions or from central and local political pressures. This is demonstrated by the emblematic question of confiscating the property of those placed under a ban, a measure feared because it could undermine the fortunes of houses torn apart by family feuds. The difficulty of acting on this treacherous ground, where municipal claims, centralizing ambitions, and corporate privileges intersected, would cost Morone the removal of his first vice-legate, the Piacentine bishop Camillo Mentuati (or Mentovati), 42 and force him unwillingly to accept a compromise that diminished his own governing powers. In August 1546, while the legate was absent - Mentuati was considered "too partial" to him 43 - the vice-legate decreed the confiscation of the property of those responsible for two murders, although the previous year Bolognese ambassadors had succeeded in extracting from Cardinal Farnese a temporary suspension of the laws authorizing such penalties. The Senate protested vigorously through its representatives in Rome, and Morone was forced to repudiate his deputy's decisions, probably in order to preserve governmental stability at a highly delicate moment, on the eve of the council's opening, and to restore exemption from confiscation for those under ban. 44

That the legate did not share this concession but was compelled to endure it is shown by the fact that in 1548, as his recall approached, he introduced provisions increasingly unfavorable to the quarrelsome Bolognese patriciate in order to protect the city's "peace," as he wrote the cardinal-nephew on February 8 of

that year. This prompted Bologna's ambassador in Rome to seek a precise order instructing him "not to proceed with the confiscation of property." 45 Morone resisted even the pressure of Paul III, who at that moment had him told "to suspend proceedings," and maintained his firm position until June 1548, when the decision to remove him had already been taken. 46 The emergence, despite political difficulties, of a policy of repression against bloody family feuds also reflected the cardinal's religious and moral convictions. These appear, for example, in the case of the groom Angelo Spagna, who served him from 1536 in Vienna, Prague, and Breslau through the years in Bologna. Spagna would testify that in Bohemia, after learning that he did not go to confession because he intended to avenge his father's murder, Morone severely rebuked him, saying that even if he achieved his purpose "it would profit him nothing, besides which […] he would then be killed himself." 47

The underlying hostility shown by part of the Bolognese nobility toward the legate - rooted in difficult relations with Rome and the strengthening of central authority - remained constant throughout his four years of government. Old resentments surfaced even during the transfer of the council, when magistrates and citizens, taking advantage of the legate's temporary absence, asked the pope to revoke the exemption from customs duties granted to the prelates attending the sessions, provoking their anger. 48 Only with difficulty, and with Morone's "intervention and approval," was an agreement reached in September 1547 between the *Reggimento* and the conciliar legates. Among other things, it provided free lodging for those in the city for the council but required payment of one gold scudo a month for changing household linen. 49

The hostility of the Bolognese patriciate was also a consequence of Morone's reforming activism, exercised in the same spirit in which he had approached his earlier diplomatic and pastoral assignments. His reputation everywhere as an energetic governor allowed him to set himself the goal of "reforming many matters pertaining to the honorable and civil life of the city by correcting and limiting certain excesses and bad customs." 50 It was through this work that the legate's role in those years came to be defined as a means by which the papal curia could learn the city's moods, as well as an instrument of mediation and control over the nobility. Morone himself would summarize his conception of the office when telling his successor, Cardinal Del Monte, that every day the legate should benevolently hear everyone, enforce the laws of administrative and moral reform, and administer justice impartially. 51 It is perhaps in this equalizing vision of government *erga omnes* - common, moreover, to almost every political structure of the sixteenth century - that one should view the legate's attempts to reduce the grave inequalities in taxation, intervening so that at least in disputes between rich and poor "the reasons of the poor might be heard." This objective was also to be pursued by commissioners who supervised the accounts of rural communities and the "misgovernment" of their inhabitants. 52 A "just man […] and lover of the poor," Morone established for this purpose the so-called *Colletta*, a form of fiscal equalization that came into force at the beginning of 1548. As the Forty wrote to the ambassadors in Rome, it was intended "for the universal benefit of the entire countryside of Bologna and of the poor peasants, to relieve them of the countless extortions and exactions by which you know how heavily they were burdened." 53

2. The Administration of Justice and the Protection of Public Morality

The four years of the legation in that university city, notorious for youthful unrest, social tension, and religious irreverence, saw Morone energetically committed to the administration of civil and especially criminal justice. The problems and transformations involved paralleled, and in some respects anticipated, those of other cities. The mass of measures issued by the Milanese cardinal formed part of the broader evolution toward a new conception and expansion of penal legislation that was taking shape in sixteenth-century Europe. 54 As Mario Sbriccoli has observed, this transition saw in the West the slow development of a culture of criminal justice understood as repression, leading to the advent of a new and wholly political paradigm. This was represented, for example, by the *Constitutio criminalis Carolina* promulgated by Charles V in 1532, and to a lesser degree by the Milanese New Imperial Constitutions issued nine years later. They sought to impose "a new style of conduct" on the machinery of justice: on the one hand curbing judicial

arbitrariness, and on the other moving, despite countless difficulties, toward preventive objectives, with criminal charges taking on a pedagogical and moralizing coloration. 55

Lengthy negotiations took place during the sixteenth century between Bologna and Rome over the delicate question of the legate's exercise of criminal jurisdiction. The strenuous defense of local prerogatives embodied in the city's criminal statutes, and the eminently political conception - in the broadest sense - of the administration of justice, especially penal justice, characteristic of the *ancien régime*, meant that the popes succeeded only very slowly in imposing effective control over the city. In Bologna too, the plurality of normative sources characteristic of the still-dominant legal particularism extended into criminal law. The statutory provisions dating from 1454 had never been abolished after the city's incorporation into the Papal States, but in practice they were no longer valid. The sole foundation for defining offenses and applying penalties was the cumbersome body of legislation contained in proclamations. In addition to issuing a series of proclamations on particular subjects, every legate published upon taking office a general proclamation listing and punishing the various categories of crime. Yet neither a particular nor a general proclamation replaced its predecessors; instead it referred back to them on questions not explicitly regulated. The law therefore developed by accumulation and overlap, generating confusion and uncertainty. 56

Within these important transformations, a significant role was played by the *Ordinationes* issued by Morone in 1548 to reform the criminal justice administered by the so-called Torrone tribunal. Established during Francesco Guicciardini's governorship, it was presided over by an auditor appointed directly by the pope but was in practice subject to the legate's supervision. 57 This tribunal was the true symbol of his power, the "manifestation of papal authority" hated by the subjects because it offered tangible proof of papal coercive strength in the face of the city's claimed autonomy. 58 On August 7, 1548, Ottavio Farnese wrote to Cardinal Del Monte urging him to replace the auditor, the Parmesan Bernardo Bergonzi. Bergonzi was "a man of the greatest integrity," 59 but "by nature too mild," whereas the office "requires a forceful and severe man, otherwise the unruly - of whom this city is full - would grow excessively bold." 60 Revised in the 1550s and later replaced by Carlo Borromeo's constitutions of 1566, which remained in force until the reform of 1744, the *Ordinationes* sought to reform a criminal justice system whose rules had become corrupted and fallen into disuse over time. The new laws annulled every case opened since the beginning of the legation in which no sentence had yet been reached, and reorganized both investigating and judicial personnel as well as what would now be called criminal procedure, so that every person summoned before the court might be protected from the arbitrary conduct and injury caused by greedy, corrupt judges. 61 The principle that must have guided Morone in this reform is well summarized in the concise description by the notary and legal agent Francesco Fronti. He dealt with Morone "almost every day" in connection with his cases and described him as "gracious and benevolent in granting audiences and an enemy of bloodshed; and if he had some villain in his hands, he preferred to keep him imprisoned for a long time rather than punish him in life or property." 62

This did not mean indulgent judicial laxity. Another notary observed that the Milanese cardinal was "in matters of justice ready to enforce obedience to his proclamations and bans" with great rigor, tolerating no favoritism, derogations, or abuses; "all who have fallen under them have been severely punished," Mentuati wrote to Rome in October 1546. 63 The fact remains that the legate's desk, like that of every powerful man on earth, was constantly covered with recommendations concerning great and small matters: 64 requests for the cancellation or mitigation of penalties, exceptions to rules, and personal favors, all the more compelling the more authoritative the petitioner. Justice thereby became one of the pieces moving across the variegated chessboard of institutional and extrainstitutional powers, social and political hierarchies, patronage networks, private friendships, and local contingencies. On the other hand, Morone himself was equally often obliged to present, recommend, and request favors and graces now for a friend, now for a servant, now for a distant relative, now for someone he could not refuse. 65 It was an intricate web in which decisions were governed less by rules than by customs, constantly shifting balances of power, and the capacity to assess, accept, or endure them with the least possible damage; to evade them through refined formulas of courtesy; to exploit them and, when possible, impose them. Exemplary was the case of Giulio Cesare Guidotti, an influential

senator arrested and tried in 1545 for serious offenses including extortion, complicity with bandits, and the falsification of judicial documents. Although Morone sent Rome a report calling for an iron fist, Guidotti's protections, including ecclesiastical ones, enabled him to be released on bail. 66 In the autumn of 1544 the duke and the cardinal of Ferrara intervened heavily to defend a family of "scoundrels" seeking the release of a relative arrested for abducting a girl, forcing Mentuati to appeal to Alessandro Farnese for help. "The nature of the person is such that anyone who thought of freeing him […] would be wishing entirely to disserve justice and ruin Cardinal Morone's legation," he wrote on October 4. 67 The unruly Pepoli counts protected perpetrators of terrible crimes, sheltered bandits on their lands along the Tuscan border, and claimed exemption from Bologna's jurisdiction, 68 while Morone postponed any plan to open "the door of pardons for murders, since almost everyone is watching to see how such cases are handled, in order to take example and courage from them." 69

To facilitate enforcement of the laws, in January 1545 the legate attempted to issue a *motu proprio* reducing the number of notaries handling civil cases, but the Senate blocked it. 70 Nor did his attempt to issue *Constitutiones* concerning the administration of civil justice fare any better. These were intended above all to eliminate abuses and promote judicial activity in an especially contentious area that touched closely on ancient corporate customs, not surprisingly defended tooth and nail by the *Reggimento*. 71 Morone's legation saw an overall intensification of penal measures, with extremely severe punishments, including death and confiscation of property, even for those who offered refuge to rebels, murderers, and bandits. 72 As early as May 1544 proclamations were issued against leaders of noble factions such as the Trombetta, 73 and rewards were placed on the Bentivoglio themselves, 74 in a relentless struggle against a rebellious nobility that was often violent and always intolerant of public jurisdiction. The task of maintaining order, hunting bandits and fugitives, carrying out searches, and arresting suspects and recalcitrant witnesses belonged to the *bargello*, appointed by the legate, 75 although in his daily activity he executed the auditor's orders. The chronicles particularly recall "a rigorous proclamation" issued by the legate in May 1548 "to suppress the frequency of murders." 76 Already on June 1 it struck Lorenzo Savi, a notorious hired killer who "came into this city and killed someone […] for money, […] using a thousand devices in doing so, so that he had spread terror through the city." Accused of yet another assassination, he was found in possession of one hundred scudi and confessed that he had acted on commission. On June 23 his hand was first cut off at the victim's house; then, carried into the square on a cart, he was beheaded. 77 The memory of this episode would lead a defense witness for Morone in 1560 to declare:

Would to God that all our superiors possessed the integrity, goodness, and religion that Cardinal Morone displayed while legate of this city. We could […] and ought continually to thank Him, because he was exemplary not only in this respect, as the whole city knows, but was also a great lover of justice, as he clearly showed while here, and found the means to punish the wicked and the gluttons. […] Many times in these past periods of adversity Cardinal Morone's government has been desired in this city, just as at present the greater part of the people desire and long for it because of his good example and conduct.

We have already mentioned that one of the principal problems facing Bolognese public justice was the feuds among noble factions. These were far from extinguished anywhere in Italy, partly because of the deficiencies of a judicial administration marked by personalism, abuse, corruption, and weak instruments of repression. 78 One of the legate's primary tasks was therefore to prevent such feuds and the cross-cutting individual and collective acts of vengeance they unleashed from disturbing the city's "good government." Yet among the serious crimes committed during his legation, the 1548 murder of the apostolic protonotary Filippo (Lippo) Ghislieri and his two sons - crushed beneath the ruins of their palace after it was brought down by an explosive charge on the orders of Cornelio Bentivoglio - demonstrates how political interference and dynastic loyalties limited the legate's penal action within an institutional context gravely compromised by clan reprisals. The rivalry between the Bentivoglio and the Ghislieri dated back to the Middle Ages. After yet another conspiracy in the mid-fifteenth century, it had led to the Ghislieri's definitive expulsion from the city and their dispersal into several branches. Cornelio Bentivoglio, a Ferrarese courtier prominent in tournaments and festivities at the Este court, had married Leonarda d'Este in 1539. After the murder of his

cousin Galeotto Malatesta, however, the ban imposed by Ercole II forced him to take refuge in Venice and then France, in the service of the dauphin Henry of Valois. Henry's accession to the throne induced the duke of Ferrara to annul the sentence in 1548, but shortly after returning home Bentivoglio had Lippo Ghislieri killed, against whom he also had economic grievances. Once again he escaped punishment, thanks to pressure from Alessandro Farnese, perhaps following intervention by the French court, although Morone wished to impose an exemplary penalty. 79

The function of the papal legate in Bologna was supposed, at least in theory, "to take concrete daily form in adapting rules to practices and modulating interventions," while respecting both papal authority and local autonomy. 80 Morone attempted to fulfill this task, as Giovanni Boccadiferro would later say, also by ordering the administration of "summary justice." 81 In contemporary usage this meant justice according to "the nature of things," the factual truth: 82 "true" justice, in other words, exercised directly and without formalism, inexpensively and accessibly to those who were not jurists or could not rely on their assistance. The legate administered the judicial sphere with the assistance of three auditors or judges presiding over civil, criminal, and public-finance cases. Since 1535 the Rota had also been active as a court of appeal in civil matters. Described by a Bolognese Lateran Canon Regular as "a person who took more pleasure, wherever this could be done without offending justice, in pardoning than in condemning," 83 Morone granted acquittals such as that of July 12, 1548, in favor of a Celestine monk who had allowed two counterfeiters to mint coins in buildings belonging to the monastery of which he was abbot; the monk's explanations convinced him that he had acted in good faith. 84 In this role as an equitable magistrate rather than a cardinal, despite the mozzetta and purple three-cornered hat, he seems to be depicted in a portrait - assuming it is indeed of him - painted in Bologna during these years by Bartolomeo Cancellieri. 85

Another subject repeatedly regulated by the legate was the long-standing question of weapons. He sought to prohibit their possession in the city and countryside and to discipline exemptions, earning a reputation for being "extremely sparing and very strict" in granting them. 86 As early as May 14, 1544, soon after reaching the city, he wrote to Cardinal Farnese to report that he had forbidden their sale. In June 1548, however, the worsening endemic banditry led him to issue a *Provision Permitting Every Person, Ecclesiastical or Secular, Living in the Castles of the Bolognese Countryside to Take Up Arms, Ring the Bells, and Pursue Bandits and Criminals*. 87 Morone's reputation as a great expert on the German world, and the delicate European political situation on the eve of Trent's opening, meant that even in this sphere his actions - quite arbitrarily - were interpreted as a sign of an imminent crusade against Lutheran Germany. In a letter written to Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo on July 11, 1545, the Franciscan Sigismondo Fedro Diruta felt entitled to infer from a Bolognese proclamation by Morone "that no armorer dare sell weapons" that the cardinal intended to buy them all for the war the pope planned to wage against the Lutherans. 88

In the protection of public morality, increasingly intertwined with criminal jurisdiction, the subjects regulated and the rules issued by Morone during the Bolognese legation were likewise shaped largely by the growing concern for public order then affecting all major European centers. The legate first sought to protect civic morality through repeated and equally futile measures to curb prostitution. 89 Especially significant in this respect was the *Proclamation* published on May 31, 1544, only a few weeks after his arrival in Bologna, no doubt also to signal the rigor that would characterize his government. Yet these were disorderly rules that mixed the temporal and spiritual. Prohibitions against blasphemy, walking about in church during religious ceremonies, visiting convents of women without permission, and gambling with dice or cards - a matter on which he was very strict even within his own household 90 - were interwoven with prohibitions against carrying offensive weapons; obligations on surgeons to report those whom they treated for wounds; bans on sheltering outlaws - "indeed, they must be arrested" - gathering in crowds and "conventicles," 91 "calling one's companion a cuckold," 92 or "throwing stones at one another." 93 Blasphemy was punished with the enormous fine of five gold scudi, followed, as was customary for this offense, by an escalating series of penalties, including corporal and infamous punishments, for repeat offenders. The prohibition against walking about in church was strictly enforced and several violators were arrested, "for which reason this

provision was heard criticized throughout the city; and it produced a bad effect, because people did not dare enter the churches for fear of encountering some trouble.” 94

The cardinal also addressed the delicate matter of sumptuary regulation, “to establish order and measure in excessive expenditure on living, clothing, and similar things,” with the usual lists of garments, ornaments, and foods, and specific dress rules for professional categories and social groups, including prostitutes, who, like Jews, were associated with the color yellow. 95 “If you want to know about Morone’s deeds,” snarled a Roman pasquinade, “go and ask the people of Bologna; | he wished to moderate all expenses, | but was always dismissed as a fool,” while another branded him “a carcass | who would infect this whole country | just as he nearly infected Bologna.” 96 Other measures concerned taxation, established rules for renting houses and shops, 97 regulated hunting, or issued provisions on the food supply, with rules governing bread, meat, and the grain trade, 98 especially in times of famine, 99 although their enforcement was often limited. Alongside regulations on the sale of meat on Fridays and during Lent, precise rules were imposed for decorating the streets through which the Corpus Christi procession passed. The legate “admonished everyone to attend it devoutly and pray to the Divine Majesty.” 100

In later years, as already noted, witnesses for the defense would offer a hagiographic image of the Milanese cardinal, insisting on his religious devotion, his commitment to eradicating heresy and protecting papal authority, his impartiality in administering justice, and the exemplary moral rectitude he sought to impose upon his entire household. Some would report that a rumor had spread in Bologna that the legate was “a virgin and […] had never experienced an act of lust,” something that the very different contemporary habits of popes and cardinals could reasonably cause to be regarded as a sign of “a kind of divinity.” 101 Many emphasized his “mild and benign nature,” saying they had never “seen him burst into rage or anger, even when occasion was sometimes given him, nor […] commit severe injustices.” His vigilance over the good conduct of the citizens led him not “to permit as easily as others do that there should be masquerades, revels, and evening gatherings, nor in any way did he wish people to walk about in church, in order to remove the occasion for ogling women, making noise and murmuring, and speaking idle and lascivious words.” In this way he earned the hatred of “idle and dissolute young men.” 102 But perhaps, to understand how he was judged by the citizens entrusted to his government - or rather by the urban patriciate perpetually committed to defending its ancient autonomy - it is better to set aside the trial records and turn to the chronicles. In the chronicle of Anton Francesco Ghiselli, later copied verbatim into the work of the Bolognese nobleman Pompeo Vizzani, one reads that Morone “gave little satisfaction to the people,” “made little account of gentlemen and magistrates,” and “with his lofty designs and continual reforms of new statutes, harsh laws, strict proclamations, and rigorous commands showed that he would have preferred to be an absolute prince rather than the pope’s legate.” 103

In ecclesiastical matters too the Milanese cardinal made full use of his legatine powers, not only for dispensations concerning marriage or admission to clerical orders, 104 but also for the conferral of benefices, without hesitating to employ punitive measures in cases of blatant abuse. When one parish priest confessed that he had bought his office, “His Most Reverend Lordship deprived him of the church”; he did the same with another priest “accused of similar simony.” 105 Despite his reforming impulses, however, Morone followed established custom in assigning numerous benefices to members of his household and fellow Milanese. Between July and August 1544, for example, he granted Beccadelli, then his secretary in Bologna, 106 revenues from the church of San Martino at Rocca Corneta, endowed with an annual income of forty ducats, while absolving the new incumbent from any censures he might have incurred in obtaining it. 107 A few months later he assigned income from the church of Saints Simon and Jude at Rubizzano to two members of his household, including the Milanese priest Antonio Maria Carabelli, who had become his secretary. 108 In 1545-46 he assigned further benefices to Carabelli, his master of the household Domenico Morando, the Modenese Pietro Marchese, and Beccadelli. 109

Among the legate’s responsibilities, amid continually uncertain boundaries between religious and civil matters, was supervision of hospitals - places of care but also of containment and control of poverty - toward which Morone, if only to set a good example, was generous in almsgiving, as he had already been in his

diocese. 110 He also had to concern himself with the public teaching of Latin and Greek at the university, which had fallen almost silent because of the prolonged absences of the professors Romolo and Pompilio Amaseo. Their protector, Alessandro Farnese, intervened repeatedly in 1545 to prevent the teaching from being entrusted to others. 111 His diligent participation in the solemn ceremonies through which the fabric of "civic religion" manifested itself, with their deep interweaving of sacred and profane, was also plainly intended to foster social cohesion and preserve a firm collective identity. 112 Especially important and laden with symbolic meaning were the traditional processions, such as that for the translation of the head of Saint Petronius from Santo Stefano to the basilica dedicated to him, "with the magistrates of this city"; 113 or the Ascension procession in which Morone walked beside the image of the Madonna of San Luca in the long cortege to the sanctuary. The Milanese cardinal always led them "wearing the rochet and the pontifical cope," 114 "something not usual or customary for other legates, but rather for governors, and he went on foot." 115 These were public signs not only of his humility in venerating the relic, as he himself would state - adding that for this "many criticized him as though he debased the dignity of the magistracy" - but also of his sensitivity to the political meanings of a ritual that formed part of "the custom of the city" and its municipal pride. 116 A canon of San Pietro would recall that the legate always celebrated the principal solemnities "with such diligence that it seemed exactly as though he himself had instituted them." At the end he pronounced the solemn blessing and granted the indulgence "from his own mouth." 117 Finally, "whenever he went to the churches of this city or through the city, his cross was carried before him, as is more widely known in this city than the fact that the Asinelli tower stands at the gate." 118

The years Morone spent in Bologna did not weaken his political and social ties with Milan, where he stayed for two weeks in January 1546. 119 This is suggested on the one hand by the Ambrosian background of many grants of benefices and certain favors performed for the papal family, and on the other by his decision to employ artists from his native city even for works of strong civic significance. As for the first point, it should be noted that in 1546 Morone's mediation was essential in bringing about the marriage of Muzio Sforza Bentivoglio, the fifteen-year-old son of Giovanni Paolo's widow, who aspired to have him designated heir to the last dukes of Milan, and his cousin Faustina, daughter of Bosio II Sforza di Santa Fiora and Costanza Farnese, herself the pope's recently deceased daughter. 120 Also connected with the legate's Milanese relationships was the summoning to Bologna, together with Giulio Romano, between October 1545 and February 1546, of Cristoforo Lombardo, known as Lombardino. A sculptor and architect formerly close to Massimiliano Stampa, he was invited by Morone to submit a design for the facade of San Petronio. An endless Gothic construction site, like Milan Cathedral, the basilica was also a symbol of the city's proud identity in opposition to papal centralism. In 1541 Iacopo Barozzi, known as Vignola, had been appointed chief architect of the basilica, with responsibility for designing and executing the facade. That same year Lombardino had met Giulio Romano on the occasion of Charles V's entry into Milan, and through Morone he was able to work for the same fee of one hundred gold scudi received by the great Gonzaga artist. Twenty scudi were also assigned to the master builder Alessandro Cavallino, whom Lombardino had employed under Anna Morone in the rebuilding of Palazzo Stampa, creating "the most resounding and clamorous imperial homage ever erected in the entire city of Milan." 121

3. The Legate and the Heretics

We have already had occasion to mention the "presumption, or perhaps madness," as Morone himself defined it, that led him to imagine it was his task to bring Germany back into the Catholic fold, inducing him "not without a little vanity" always to show benevolence toward Germans, especially at Bologna. 122 There the familial, political, and religious roots of his irenicism found a kind of laboratory. The city's international openness, its intellectual vitality, the university with its many foreign students, and the presence of a substantial heretical movement gave the legate, at least initially, the opportunity to revive the irenic strategy toward religious dissent that he had attempted during his nunciatures in Germany and later in his diocese. "His having shown himself very partial to this side has been a great spur to making him more beloved and to making every action of his appear even better," Girolamo Aleandro had observed as early as 1538 in a dispatch sent from Linz to Paul III, at once describing and criticizing the nuncio's strategy. 123 "It seemed

proper to me that there should be someone in Italy whom they [the Lutherans] did not wholly abhor," Morone himself would write after his arrest in 1557: 124

Although I believed that there were Lutheran students [in Bologna], I did not seek them out, and if they had done nothing scandalous I said nothing to them. Indeed, I granted them favors, such as permission to carry weapons and so forth. And because I knew that in Germany there was great curiosity to learn about affairs in Italy, I also strove not to acquire the reputation of a persecutor of Lutherans, so that I might win them over, if it pleased God.

In reality, during the very years of the Bolognese legation, Morone soon understood that hopes for renewal within the Church were weakening, while the theological decrees approved by a council in which the Lutherans would never participate aimed above all to sanction their condemnation without appeal. By the end of the 1540s the closing of every space for dialogue was consolidating the primacy of the strictest orthodoxy, in which any spirit of moderation was equated with heretical disobedience. Far from still being a political strategy, the position Morone defended at the beginning of his trial was merely a weak defensive tactic, one that even led him to lament that ten years earlier "religious matters in Italy proceeded with little order, because the office of the Holy Inquisition had not been established or was not yet firmly founded and vigorous." 125 The same occurred in Bologna, where an inquisitor appointed by Rome took office only at the end of the 1540s; until then, the hunt for heretics had been conducted by the bishop's vicar and the papal legate. 126

During the preceding decade the lively climate of the university city had attracted Camillo Renato, who lived there under the pseudonym Lisia Fileno and formed a group of pupils, among them the man who decided to denounce him. After taking refuge in Modena and falling into the inquisitorial net, the Sicilian heresiarch was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment and transferred to the Bolognese prisons. He managed to escape and made his way to the Grisons, where he came into conflict with the Reformed pastors and eventually directed his *De iniusto Michaelis Serveti incendio* against Calvin himself. Also active in the city at that time were the mysterious Eusebio Renato, author of *Homilies on the Gospels for the Entire Year*; Ortensio Lando, recently returned from Lucca, where he had associated with a patriciate broadly oriented toward Calvinism; Fileno Lunardi; and the Abruzzese student Giovanni Angelo Oddoni. The last two had lived at Strasbourg between 1534 and 1537 and remained in correspondence with Martin Bucer, who wrote to the "brethren" of the Modenese and Bolognese churches rejoicing at the success of their proselytism. They devoted themselves to heterodox propaganda, gathering around them a group of humanists receptive to the European religious debate. 127 In Bologna in 1532 there also appeared the Franciscan - later Capuchin - Giovanni Pili's *Conflagration of Lutheran Tares*, one of the earliest attacks on the "perfidious" Luther addressed in the vernacular to "simple, illiterate, and ignorant persons."

In subsequent years the *Summary of Holy Scripture* circulated widely in Bologna, and hundreds of copies were publicly burned in 1538. The previous year, and again in 1541, a large audience followed Bernardino Ochino's Lenten sermons; in 1538 the "scandalous" sermons of the Milanese Augustinian Giulio Della Rovere, later an exile in Switzerland in 1543; and in 1539 the lectures of the Franciscan Giovanni Buzio da Montalcino, who was hanged and burned in Campo de' Fiori in 1553. The investigation opened in 1543 against the disciples of Camillo

Renato, two years after his flight, brought to light a "heretical depravity" spread throughout every social rank in the city where, a few months later, Morone would enter as legate. It was on that occasion that proceedings began against a substantial local heterodox community led by the weaver Tommaso Bavella and the already familiar Giovan Battista Scotti. Scotti nevertheless escaped with an abjuration, thanks in part to Pole's protection, only to resume professing the same doctrines shortly afterward.

As we have seen, the reputation for holding views at variance with Catholic orthodoxy had accompanied Morone's appointment as legate, which Carnesecchi and Soranzo had celebrated with Scotti, with whom they had long maintained relations of complicity. 128 Encouraged by their urgings, the Bolognese silk worker, now once again active in the heretical camp, presented himself to the cardinal and, emboldened by his reactions, had the opportunity to discuss with him in private the most incendiary religious questions. It was then, for example, that he gave him a copy of Luther's short treatise *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen*, published in German at Wittenberg in 1543 and at Frankfurt the following year under the title *De iudaeis et eorum mendaciis*. 129 Morone decided to hand the copy over to the Holy Office, he would say, "because it was against the Jews, of whom there were many in Bologna and who were favored by Christians." In his opinion, "had the author not been wicked, [...] the book would be very good (with a few of his usual excesses corrected) against these enemies of our faith, because he used sound arguments and authorities to refute them." The plan to translate it soon foundered, however, and the volume was eventually deposited with others in the Vatican Library,130 without the Milanese cardinal ever finding time to read it because, as he would tell his inquisitors, "my nature and inclination soon grow weary of much reading and writing." 131

Scotti himself would recount how, during their meetings, Morone had allowed himself words and conduct that were incautious, to say the least. He allegedly declared, for example, that "he did not consider himself bishop of Modena, and that he obeyed Pope Paul III merely as a secular prince," and that "woe to him if the pope had known what was in his mind concerning matters of religion." His interlocutor therefore concluded that he believed neither "in the sacrament of orders in bishops nor in the pope's primacy in spiritual matters over the whole Church." 132 If Scotti is to be believed, moreover, he gave money as alms to the poorest among the "brethren" 133 and, more seriously still, promised "not to execute any commission from Rome against the Lutherans of Bologna without first having them warned." By Scotti's own admission, however, this never happened, since no such request ever arrived. 134 In support of his charges, Scotti would mention the members of Morone's household whose orthodoxy was doubtful, such as Morando and Villamarina; the help he gave Carnesecchi in concert with Pole when the former was first summoned to Rome in 1546; and the heterodox books he had seen in his house - a house, according to the Perugian inquisitor Matteo Lachi, filled with Lutherans. 135

Others too would recall suspicious behavior by the Milanese cardinal during his Bolognese legation. One figure to whom we shall return several times, the ambiguous and corrupt priest from Vercelli Lorenzo Davidico, for example, would report a long conversation "in his chamber" in which it had seemed to him - not without "great astonishment" - that, in speaking of the grace of Christ, Morone "excluded works, weakened free will, and was consonant, at least in the sound of his words, with the language of so many Lutherans." 136 In the course of a similar conversation, Reginaldo Nerli would say that he heard Morone speak "falsely and heretically" about the adoration of the cross and the relics of the saints. Yet after his interlocutor corrected him, Morone assured him that he always wished to abide by what "holy mother the Roman Catholic Church holds and teaches," apologizing for an error caused by his theological incompetence and promising not to intervene on such subjects in the future. Nerli also reported that, during a solemn ceremony in San Domenico, Morone caused great scandal among the friars by failing to kneel before the saint's precious relic. He later said that one should not "show the relics of saints as much reverence as the most holy sacrament and our Lord God," and that he was greatly astonished "that our learned and prudent fathers tolerated so many lights around the head and shrine of Saint Dominic and so few before the most holy sacrament." 137

Others would reproach him for mocking the way the friars "filled their mouths so grandly" when singing the *Salve Regina*, saying that they celebrated the Virgin more than Christ, "and that we ought to go to

Christ." 138 After discussing with him several times the religious doctrines dividing Europe, the inquisitor Fra Domenico Adelasio did not hesitate to tell him bluntly: "Monsignor, you are wrong: these are Lutheran opinions." 139 Still others, once he had returned to Rome, were surprised that he dismissed as mere "superstition" the popular belief that labor pains would disappear if women girded themselves with the cords used to measure the chair of the first pontiff, sold at the doors of Saint Peter's on the feast day of the saint. 140

Many witnesses for Morone's defense, especially those from Bologna, would present a wholly different image of the pious and thoroughly ecclesiastical prelate,141 respected and loved by everyone, always diligent in the duties of a "religious, Catholic, and good Christian." They described him as an assiduous visitor to churches, sermons, processions, and masses, which he attended "almost every morning"; generous in giving alms to the poor, "especially religious and Catholics"; a strenuous defender of papal authority and of the doctrine that "our faith [...] without works is dead"; a convinced supporter of the veneration of saints and relics, which he practiced "with the greatest and most immense devotion"; strict in ensuring that the members of his household were "upright, honest, well-conducted, Catholic persons, without stain or infamy of any kind" and diligent in "observing all the laws, rites, and praiseworthy customs of the holy Roman Church, and in particular in confessing and communicating at least four times a year," as well as fasting "on all vigils, throughout Lent, on the Ember Days, and on the other fasts commanded by holy Church." He was always ready to receive in his house "friars and secular priests and also prelates, learned, lettered, and Catholic, in theology as in every other Catholic and Christian science," and "to discuss the Catholic faith and the authority of the holy apostolic see, always protecting and defending them." Many would also emphasize his bitterness that "Lutheranism flourished all too abundantly in his diocese," his diligence in preventing the spread of prohibited books, and his general severity toward heretics. 142 In reality, however, things had gone somewhat differently until 1544.

It is likely that in Bologna Morone committed the same indiscretions that had already betrayed him at Trent, even before they did so in his own diocese,143 although it remains very difficult to understand his actual role in the circulation of ideas, readings, material assistance, favors, and protection within Bologna's heterodox milieu. During his trial he would claim not even to remember Scotti's name. By then Scotti had become an informer in the pay of the Roman Holy Office,144 and his abrupt change of sides had dealt a devastating blow to his entire network of contacts and complicities with heretical groups and movements: above all those in Bologna, of course, but also the spirituali, with some of whom he had maintained an active traffic in prohibited books. News quickly spread of the new abjuration Scotti made before Alfonso Salmerón in 1547, and Scotti himself took the trouble to tell Morone, who could not suppress an indignant reaction to the impudence of this turncoat, now intent on presenting himself as a devout Catholic and denouncing his former companions in faith. When Morone met him and heard him defend "justification in the Catholic manner, as it had been determined at Trent," he replied curtly that "he would leave others to trust as much as they liked in their own merits, and [...] wanted no merits for himself other than those of Christ." And when Scotti began speaking ill of the Lutherans, "especially those who had written books against the Church as lying and deceitful men," Morone did not hesitate to tell him plainly that "it was better to leave these Lutherans alone and tolerate them, since God, who could annihilate them with a nod, endured them." 145 Even for a man of such vast political experience, this meant swallowing the bait of a provocation, although he knew full well that his words would be reported to the proper authorities.

Morone was equally incautious when, during the Bolognese sittings of the council, in the presence of several bishops and the future cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla, he declared that "a decree of the Council of Trent on justification ought to be torn up because it was not sound, and another made according to the truth." 146 This charge was only partly contradicted by a witness who had heard the cardinal say in his Roman residence that he would observe "what they have determined, but I would have expected this matter of justification to be made a little clearer." 147 It is all the more credible because it is confirmed by an anonymous letter sent to Paul IV in June 1557, when Morone was already imprisoned in Castel Sant'Angelo,148 and by a memorial signed by Cardinal Mendoza himself at Burgos on 5 March 1560. 149

Although heresy did not fall within the legate's direct jurisdiction, his delegations in spiritual matters were so broad that they sometimes led him to the edge of the Inquisition's sphere of authority and prompted decisions that could appear reassuring to heterodox circles. One such measure was the pardon he granted, by virtue of the "special authority" conferred on him by the pope, to the patrician Angelo Ruggeri, who had been tried and sentenced to death by the inquisitor on 23 June 1544. In later years the cardinal would try to present the affair as evidence of his rigor against heretics. 150 It was a sensational episode, recorded in all the city chronicles and recounted by Boccadiferro as follows:151

> When the Gonfalonier of Justice, Messer Giulio Felicini, and the Lords Elders were to enter office, one of the latter was Messer Angelo Ruggeri, who, having previously been condemned to death as a heretic and later abjured but not yet absolved, wished to enter with the other lords. The cardinal had him told that under no circumstances was he to enter, because he would not allow him to exercise the magistracy, and he excluded him. After Ruggeri was absolved, the cardinal suspended him from legal practice and restored him only with great difficulty and at the entreaties of many.

It is worth recalling that this occurred only a few days after the no less sensational recantation pronounced by Bartolomeo della Pergola in Modena Cathedral to refute the heresies he had preached there a few months earlier. The more or less open protection Morone afforded the Franciscan must have been known to some Bolognese heterodox figures, several of whom met him at the time. 152 The same was true of the fact that, to arm the Bolognese garrison, he employed the Brescian crossbow maker Ludovico Medighini, who had fled the city two years earlier because he was suspected of heresy;153 that he allowed Dominican and Augustinian friars to preach sermons in which even the young student Konrad Erastus detected Zwinglian echoes; that he permitted the heterodox weaver Tommaso Bavella to return to the city after a long exile; and that he took no action against the heretical group - whose existence he can hardly have ignored - that met during the years of the council to hear readings from the Pauline epistles and prohibited books. Its members included the brothers Teseo and Ulisse Aldrovandi, Lelio Sozzini, Sebastiano Mainetti, the canon of San Petronio Girolamo Dal Pino, and members of noble families,154 as well as the Camaldolese prior of San Damiano and a large group of Canons Regular of San Salvatore, but also nobles, booksellers, men of letters, religious, and artisans.

The controversial transfer of the Council of Trent, the cause of a bitter clash between pope and emperor, as we shall shortly see, turned Bologna into a nerve center of high European politics. A great many prelates were present, and some of them could not fail to notice the widespread heretical presence, all the more scandalous because it had taken root in a city subject to papal authority and now serving as the seat of the ecumenical synod. To denounce that presence, however, was also to level a severe criticism at the inefficiency or laxity of the authorities responsible for suppressing heterodox groups and movements. It is difficult to escape the impression that, although unnamed, Morone was the unspoken target of the indictment sent in November 1547 to Cervini - papal legate to the council and also a member of the Roman Holy Office - by the bishop of Verona, Alvise Lippomano, then in Bologna for the assembly's proceedings. Lippomano called for an iron fist against "these wicked Lutherans," taking the Iberian Inquisitions as his model:155

> Why is the severest Inquisition not established throughout all the lands of the Church against these wicked Lutherans, and why are they not punished according to their deserts? I do not wish to speak now of Rome; I shall speak only of Bologna. Are there not an infinite number of them here? Worse still, this impiety is spread more by women than by men, and yet nullus est qui quaerat et videat [there is no one who seeks and sees], and every day matters go from bad to worse. I would certainly wish His Holiness to gird himself with his most powerful sword for this holy work and, without regard for any person and with no aim other than the honor of God and the salvation of souls, to have all these criminals punished as the sacred canons command. For if temporal rulers saw His Holiness acting in earnest in his own house, where he faces no opposition, they too would be compelled to take action, at least for their own advantage if not out of regard for God. For, as Your Most Reverend Lordship has said on other occasions, this heresy begins with the Pater Noster and ends with the pike and the arquebus. They say that the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal are too severe, and I reply that they are highly useful, for in those parts they have at least borne this fruit: this most pestilential seed has not reached them, nor does one ever hear even Martin's name there. If severe justice were carried out in the lands of His Beatitude, I would hope by the grace of God that within a

year it would be wholly and utterly extinguished; once a hundred or two hundred had been punished, perhaps no three hundred more would be found.

Beyond the complicities that emerge from this picture, what has been described as a kind of "tacit toleration" by the Milanese cardinal toward Bologna's heterodox inhabitants156 must be situated in the fragile and disjointed operational reality of the peripheral Inquisitions in the years before and immediately after the foundation of the Roman Holy Office. The still uncertain and sometimes even conciliatory activity of the local tribunals of faith157 was evident in Bologna in the moderation of the inquisitors trained in the lecture halls of the renowned *Studium* at the Dominican convent, beginning with Leandro Alberti and Tommaso Maria Beccadelli. 158 As for the vicar and suffragan bishop Agostino Zanetti, his efforts to suppress religious dissent in the 1530s and 1540s were accompanied by an attempt to educate the secular clergy in a more rigorous religious life. This is shown, for example, by the edition of a collection of synodal constitutions whose appendix contained a set of instructions entitled Breve ricordo, already published at Verona in 1530 at Gian Matteo Giberti's behest.

The link between Giberti's Verona and Zanetti's Bologna was another in many respects emblematic figure: the Bolognese priest Niccolò Bargellesi. He had lived in the Veronese circle of the reforming bishop and later returned to Bologna, where in 1538 he published Jan van Ruusbroec's *Libelli duo* and, in the 1540s, obtained the title of *inquisitor apostolicus* with responsibility for supervising books, a post he retained at least until 1561. 159 In that capacity Bargellesi collaborated with Morone. Yet in the early 1540s he had corresponded with Flaminio in a way that led the latter, Ochino, and Soranzo to hope that he might draw close to Valdesian spirituality, and perhaps for that reason Morone appointed him confessor to his household. Bargellesi was among the first to read the still unpublished *Beneficio di Cristo*, which Flaminio sent him in the summer of 1542. He immediately delivered it to Contarini after marking in the margins the passages he judged at variance with Roman orthodoxy. 160

The very breadth of Morone's legatine jurisdiction *in spiritualibus*, closely connected in turn with the temporal sphere, also makes it difficult to assign a single religious character to his conduct in Bologna. His position as bishop of Modena and at the same time legate in Bologna could itself give rise to delicate problems, since the diocese lay within the Este duchy, whose endemic conflict with the Papal States was continually fed by the movement of people and goods, smuggling, and crime. "Between the duke of Ferrara and me while I was legate in Bologna," Morone would later write, "there were many serious disputes over borders and waters, in which public notaries, soldiers, and others of mine were killed." 161

All the more so because he had also been appointed legate of Romagna, although that province was taken from him little more than a year after his installation, in June 1545, and made into an autonomous legation. 162 His jurisdiction also covered many "police" measures163 concerning urban centers, such as the grain supply, the preparation and price of bread, meat markets, provisions to be adopted during outbreaks of plague, the protection of river embankments, the activities of secondhand dealers, fishing, hunting, grain, vagrancy, the structure and levying of customs duties, and the operations of the mint, where, among other things, he had coins struck bearing his coat of arms. 164 Many of these matters in turn had implications *in spiritualibus*, as the case of customs duties shows. Their administration could sometimes clash with the inquisitors' desire to monitor the circulation of suspicious letters and books and their continual attempts to acquire instruments for controlling the movement of merchants and merchandise. 165 Don Nicola Bargellesi would state that Morone "was most diligent in seeing to it that heretical books were not allowed through, sold, or kept," threatening customs officials who failed to permit their seizure with severe punishment. 166

The atmosphere of uncertainty and disorientation, however, was rapidly coming to an end, especially after the approval of the first Tridentine decrees, which Morone's very position obliged him to follow. During the Bolognese legation, for example, if Bargellesi is to be believed, the legate learned that Contarini had rendered a negative judgment on the *Beneficio di Cristo*167 and that a senator possessed the little book without knowing of its heresies. He immediately had it confiscated, and later ordered the copies found in the shop of the heterodox bookseller Cristoforo Dossena to be taken to the library of San Domenico. 168 Many documents likewise attest his zeal not only in requiring Modena's parish priests to use confessional summae,

books, manuals, and pastoral instructions of unquestionable Catholic orthodoxy,169 but also in summoning and admonishing them and at times administering severe rebukes "because he found the churches badly ordered and the priests ignorant and bad examples, and he even kept I do not know how many of them in prison." 170 All this confirms that by 1545 Morone's return to the ranks of Catholic orthodoxy was complete.

4. Resignation from the Bishopric

During his residence in Bologna, the control of heresy in Modena became particularly delicate. Far from having been eradicated by the imposition of the 1542 profession of faith, it continued to spread through the city's social fabric, taking root even among merchants and artisans and assuming increasingly clear Calvinist features. The tenacious heterodox presence in the Emilian city would endure for a long time, into the 1560s and beyond. In 1546 a Lutheran prince called it the "only blessed city in Italy," 171 and the following year the notorious bishop Dionigi Zannettini, known as Grechetto, still regarded it as a dangerous hotbed of heretical infection. 172 That judgment was anything but arbitrary, given that in 1547 a secretary of the bishop of Fano and future cardinal Pietro Bertano, then at Trent for the council, could inform Bertano's cousin and associate Bonifacio Valentini of Luther's death and of the great grief his patron had felt, mourning him not only as "an upright and holy man" but as "the head of the true Church." 173

Alongside his inability to reside permanently in his diocese, the stubborn resistance of the heretical groups and the risk that he himself might be caught up in the inquisitorial repression being prepared in Rome undoubtedly played a decisive role in inducing Morone to resign the bishopric. It was no coincidence that, on the eve of Juan de Meneses's preaching, the duke's proclamation against heresy, and Filippo Valentini's flight,174 Alessandro Farnese wrote to Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora on 26 April 1545 to report that Morone, "without any sanctimonious pretense and moved by good zeal," was asking to leave the bishopric of Modena, where affairs "were in a bad state." He was ready to accept as his successor the then bishop of Fano - to whose see Morone would in turn be transferred - because Bertano was "a native of Modena and a man capable of recognizing the sickness of those people and curing it." Lancillotti, by contrast, always displayed a profound aversion toward him. 175 The pope apparently declared himself willing to accommodate Morone's wish to "unburden himself of that charge," a wish he had already expressed in 1542,176 and to appoint Bertano to Modena, as Ercole Gonzaga wrote to the Este duke on 15 July 1545. Gonzaga also informed him, however, that the strong-minded Dominican had refused, pleading *nemo propheta in patria* [no prophet is accepted in his own country]. 177

Years later, when already imprisoned, the Milanese cardinal would admit that he had been unable to provide as he wished for the "eradication of the heresies in Modena because I was not learned and could not reside there," and later, after his appointment as legate of Bologna, because his many jurisdictional conflicts with the duke of Ferrara had prevented him from relying on a "favorable secular arm." For this reason, in 1550 he finally decided to resign the bishopric in favor of Egidio Foscarari, master of the Sacred Palace since 1547. 178 As a Dominican and a man "of the finest life and learning," Foscarari could, "with assiduity and tact and with divine help, bring those wandering souls back." 179 Some would say that Pole had suggested the appointment of this man, whom Carnesecchi described as "universally held irreproachable in life and learning" and Beccadelli as "truly a mirror of Italian prelates," 180 because he was capable of "taking measures against the heretics of that city." 181

> "That bishop," Morone would say, "knows how earnestly I begged and charged him concerning this, also reminding him that His Lordship must try, with sound doctrine, assiduity, patience, every kindness, and charity, to bring back those forceful minds, because they were very obstinate, believed themselves to know a great deal, and were surrounded by many family ties, friendships, and favors at the court of the duke of Ferrara. I named to him those whom I suspected, namely the members of the Academy, and in addition I named the provost, Messer Bonifacio Valentini."

During his Bolognese legation Morone had had the opportunity to know and associate with Foscarari, whose intellectual gifts, theological learning, moral integrity, and aversion to purely repressive strategies he continued to appreciate. That aversion had matured in part through Foscarari's regular participation in

meetings of the Congregation of the Holy Office during his years as master of the Sacred Palace. 182 Once bishop of Modena, it would lead him to use the weapons of persuasion against the heterodox and, despite the Dominican habit he wore, to avoid the intervention of inquisitors by every possible means. It was the same path Pole and Morone had followed in the past, according to whom "one should proceed with charity and not with such severity in bringing these heretics back, more through kindness and gentleness than through such rigor." 183

As already noted, however, after the Tridentine decree on justification was approved in January 1547, the Milanese cardinal, from the height of his political experience, now looked with some embarrassment upon the doctrines he had embraced in the early 1540s. It is therefore likely that his wish for Foscarari to succeed him arose from a need for pastoral continuity that also served as a precaution, a kind of guarantee that his own conduct in the past would not be called into question. Seen from this perspective, the trial of the Bolognese Dominican ordered by Pope Carafa during Morone's imprisonment would also have aimed - whatever the investigation's outcome - to prevent Foscarari's future elevation to the cardinalate. This is shown by the furious reaction of the inquisitors when Pius IV raised the possibility in the summer of 1560, in view of the imminent reconvening of the Council of Trent. Among other things, they hastened to denounce to the king of Spain the fact that "the college is now entirely Lutheran" and that this exemplary prelate was "Morone's man, whom he will want as his companion in matters of the council." 184

Already in July 1548, during a very brief stop in Modena to meet the Este duke on one of his journeys to Milan, rumors spread through the city that Morone wished "to exchange the bishopric of Modena for another prelacy, because the council has ordered bishops to reside in their bishoprics." 185 A few months later, in January 1549, it was again rumored that Bertano would succeed him, and the proposed change was linked to the cardinal's involvement in an anti-papal conspiracy. 186 Everything seemed to come to a halt during the interminable conclave that followed Paul III's death. As Lancillotti recorded on 23 January 1550, the result of one ballot led him to hope that the bishop of his city might be elected pope, "because he was one of the four proposed by His Imperial Majesty." 187 Once the new pontiff had been installed, however, Morone obtained his approval of Foscarari's name within a very short time, so that by 21 April he could inform his trusted Filippo Gheri that by March "the master of the Sacred Palace will become bishop of Modena." 188

In reality, Foscarari's appointment was formalized only on 23 May, and on the thirtieth Lancillotti reported it, though he mistakenly gave him the name of the Bolognese inquisitor Leandro Alberti and thus referred to him as "Fra Liandro di Fuscarari." 189 The new bishop entered the city in his friar's habit on 15 July, accompanied by the hope of the old notary, a fierce opponent of every religious novelty, that "he will set straight those people who do not walk rightly in the way of God." 190 On 10 August Foscarari summoned all the chaplains and urged them, among other things, to warn the faithful that "those who possess prohibited books concerning the faith must present them to the inquisitor, and whoever has erred must return to penance within three months," in accordance with the edicts of Julius III. 191 Over the following weeks the Modenese chronicler recorded with lively satisfaction the bishop's humility in attending solemn rites, his unusual habit of preaching and administering confirmation, the strict rules he issued for priestly conduct and the examinations he imposed before ordination, his solicitude for the poor, his devout participation in processions, and the blessings he imparted with the relic of Saint Geminianus's arm. 192 On 7 April 1551 Lancillotti noted the arrival of a vicar, Francesco Fantini of Ferrara, because Foscarari, "a most learned man," was preparing to travel to Trent, where "the priests of the council showed him more honor than could be told," he wrote when recording his departure on 28 June. 193 Foscarari would not return to Modena until 10 April 1552. 194 Lancillotti continued to esteem him highly, convinced that "had past bishops followed this style, Christians would be devout," and ready to hold him up as an example to "all prelates" who instead squandered "the goods of the poor in lust, gaming, and gluttony when they ought to devote themselves to study in order to set a good example for the people." 195

Many praised Morone for finally resigning that "much maligned" diocese, as he himself called it when informing the Este duke of the transfer of authority. 196 He nevertheless reserved for himself a pension of 650 ducats and the collation of benefices, as Lancillotti recorded on 30 April. 197 The latter was a

prerogative he always sought to retain, both as a valuable means of furnishing his relatives with some ecclesiastical income and as an instrument for renewing the clergy. 198 To some his resignation appeared unusual. When the cardinal of Lénoncourt shortly afterward did the same in favor of a nephew, Bernardino Maffei believed that he had followed Morone's example "of remaining without a bishopric." 199 Transferred on 25 February 1549 to the titular church of Santo Stefano al Celio, the Milanese cardinal left his successor a situation far worse than the one he had inherited almost twenty years earlier, because of the increasingly pervasive presence of heretical groups now conscious of an alternative ecclesial identity lived in secrecy.

The great expectations with which he had entered Modena in 1533 had been disappointed. He now abandoned the episcopal chair under Lancillotti's severe judgment, which placed him alongside his mediocre and inattentive predecessors, responsible for the fact that "we Modenese have not had a bishop for at least fifty years," although the city had "the greatest need of one, because its people are ill-conducted in the way of God; all this has come from the bad shepherds who have founded and enjoyed the milk of the bishopric and have let the sheep fall into the mouths of wolves." 200 It was disappointment itself that made the chronicler particularly harsh toward Morone. He attributed the resignation to an explicit order from the new pontiff, who opposed "the most reverend cardinals having bishoprics instead of bishops, so that bishops may remain in their bishoprics, because by failing to reside they have been and are the cause of heresy and of the disorders of the Church and of Christendom." Yet the chronicler was looking above all at Modena when he wrote that, while Morone was merely a bishop, "he was held to be a little saint, young though he was, but after he became a cardinal people no longer considered him a little saint." This was especially because he had entrusted the administration of diocesan property to unscrupulous businessmen who "gave the whole city cause to talk, above all in the leasing of the shops." Lancillotti hoped that his successor "will not tolerate people being wronged or mistreated as the said Most Reverend Morone has tolerated." 201

The cardinal was now entrusting the diocese to a bishop exemplary in morals, culture, and pastoral commitment. Yet the choice of Foscarari must be evaluated first of all in light of the fact that the trials of Iacopo Nacchianti, bishop of Chioggia, and Vittore Soranzo, bishop of Bergamo, began precisely in 1549-50, while Pier Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capodistria, fled north of the Alps to escape the Holy Office. 202 The tightening of repression was unmistakable. While the supreme inquisitors gathered documents and testimony to bring into the conclave in order to block Pole's candidacy, the circle was closing ever more tightly around the spirituali, especially those whose pastoral duties had a public dimension and therefore exposed them more readily to suspicion and accusation, from which their social and ecclesiastical rank could no longer protect them.

Undoubtedly agreed with the new pope, Julius III, the choice of Foscarari was therefore intended to ensure the continuity of a mild pastoral approach to heretical dissent, aimed more at persuasion than repression. But it was also - and perhaps above all - designed to place at the head of the diocese a man whose Thomist orthodoxy, learned in the Bolognese *Studium*, was not devoid of sympathy for the spirituali. This is shown by the fact that he attended Flaminio at the moment of his death in Pole's Roman house, on the very eve of his episcopal appointment. 203 Whatever the unknowable truth of the episode, which may have been constructed after the fact, it permits Foscarari's role to be situated within the spirituali's broader defensive strategy, with which in any case he had no hesitation in cooperating. According to the legend promoted by the Theatine Antonio Caracciolo, by contrast, Carafa himself had brought the dying Flaminio back to the path of orthodoxy. 204 Flaminio was thus destined to remain even post mortem a symbolic figure in the political and religious conflict at the highest levels of the curia, trapped between opposing and equally improbable apologetic narratives.

Foscarari had already intervened in inquisitorial matters under Paul III. On 25 June 1549, together with Usodimare, he was entrusted with supplementing the catalogues of prohibited books published at Louvain and Paris,205 thereby beginning the preparation of the first Roman Index. His moderation in inquisitorial affairs, similar to that of other brethren who had lived at San Domenico in Bologna,206 is also evident from his role in the trial held in 1549 against the Lateran Canon Regular Ippolito Chizzola. Chizzola's first Roman interrogation took place in the presence of only the commissioner general of the Holy Office, Teofilo

Scullica. The following day the then master of the Sacred Palace joined him, doubtless to supervise his conduct and temper his intransigence. 207 The division of roles is revealing: the theologian Foscarari was asked to question Chizzola about his doctrines, while the inquisitor Scullica concentrated on his possible accomplices. 208 It was above all for this reason that Foscarari was chosen to succeed Morone at Modena: because he wished to pursue a strategy of mediation, patience, and, if necessary, compromise. Such a strategy could form a kind of barrier between the Modenese heretics and the Roman inquisitors, resolve religious conflicts locally, and prevent the supreme tribunal of the faith from taking over investigations that might produce indications and evidence capable of being used against the Milanese cardinal. 209

It was no coincidence that one of Foscarari's first initiatives in Modena was to transfer the Inquisition, and therefore its archives, from the convent of San Domenico to the episcopal palace, where he could better supervise its work. His brethren, indeed, had very little to do, since the new bishop preferred to practice a kind of "privatization of heresy," 210 recording in a small notebook the names of the many heterodox persons whom he summoned either to register their extrajudicial abjurations, without witnesses or a formal record, or simply to admonish them. 211 This was not an arbitrary initiative of his own. It was authorized by the brief through which, on 21 July 1550, the day after his episcopal appointment, the pope granted him the power to suspend suspected preachers and confessors and to absolve *in utroque foro* heretics who had abjured, "*non tamen relapsos*" [but not relapsed heretics]. 212 In this way the pontiff revealed his wish to keep the Roman Inquisition away from the city whose bishop Morone had been. Little or not at all interested in Foscarari's reforming zeal except as a source of suspicion, the Holy Office would later accuse him of unspeakable complicities with the Milanese cardinal and the city's heretical movement. As late as 1575, an inquisitor of Modena would deplore that brief of Julius III, which had made Foscarari the "pope of Modena, waiting for them all to come to penance, some by word alone without writing, some with a witness, some without: provided they returned, everyone was accepted." 213

Foscarari's pastoral strategy, founded on the conviction that heresies should be fought with the weapons of persuasion and dialogue, must therefore be seen not merely as a personal choice or as the expression of a gentleness that had become a settled mental habit, as has been suggested,214 but as a conscious political action directed toward a broader context and inserted into the struggle then under way between Julius III and the Holy Office. 215 Hence the aversion and soon the suspicions of the Roman inquisitors, which became certainty after his death, when they learned of the inadmissibly conciliatory practice he had adopted toward heretics and suspects. That practice had involved a great many people, for in 1572 the notebooks in which he had recorded his extrajudicial absolutions were transcribed into two volumes totaling 350 pages. Meanwhile Cardinal Rebiba, who had become Pius V's trusted agent in directing the Holy Office, declared bluntly that Foscarari's "actions [...] against heretics in that city are not recognized by this Holy Office." 216

As for Morone, in a very different historical moment and after enduring a long inquisitorial trial, he would become bishop of Modena again in 1564, after Foscarari's death and after governing - once again mostly from afar - the diocese of Novara entrusted to him in 1552. 217 In 1551, however, he had an *Aviso di quanto si ha da osservare dalli predicatori nella città et diocesi di Modena per ordine del reverendissimo et illustrissimo cardinale Morone* [Notice of What Preachers Must Observe in the City and Diocese of Modena by Order of the Most Reverend and Illustrious Cardinal Morone] published under the seal of his authority. Its provisions were marked by the strictest orthodoxy, beginning with the duty always to present oneself as "Catholic and obedient to the holy Roman Church, teaching the truth in all those articles that are today attacked by heretics, such as the authority of the divine apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions by which it is governed." Besides the need to set a good example for the faithful, speak simply, and seek no reward, the instructions insisted above all on specific doctrinal points: the cult of the saints and the veneration of images; the pope's authority as Christ's vicar on earth; auricular confession; purgatory; justification "by inherent righteousness and grace, not by imputed righteousness alone"; the meritorious value of works; freedom of the will; observance of fasts and feast days; and the sacraments, with special emphasis on Eucharistic transubstantiation. Preachers were to take particular care "in teaching the principles of Christian doctrine,

commonly called the catechism, namely the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the seven sacraments, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the seven works of mercy." 218

Foscarari probably wrote this short text, as suggested by its numerous biblical citations, which reveal substantial theological competence, while Morone appears in the title only as the person who had given the "order" for its publication. It is equally likely that it emerged from the synod of the diocesan clergy convened at Modena on 8 April 1551, on which occasion the new bishop "told them how they were to conduct themselves in soul and body, to the honor of God and holy mother Church." 219 Morone's "order" therefore requires explanation, especially since at that date he no longer had jurisdiction over the diocese. Perhaps he wished to strengthen his successor's authority by lending the normative text the weight of his own personal and institutional prestige. Perhaps he wished to make public, both in Modena and Rome, the absolute orthodoxy inspiring both his own and Foscarari's pastoral choices, thereby preparing a document capable of silencing anyone who might seek to target him after the incidents of previous years involving Bartoli, Salmerón, and Pergola.

Just as the religious enthusiasm born of his encounter with Pole and Flaminio at Trent had soon faded - or withdrawn into the secrecy of his conscience - after the first disastrous experiences of attempting to translate it into pastoral reform, so the prospect now began to emerge that sooner or later he would have to reckon with the Roman Holy Office. Within a few years Morone, and with him all the spirituali, moved from a strategy filled with hopes of reforming the Church to the need to defend themselves, hoping that retreat into the Nicodemite cocoon of their providential expectations might at least preserve their good name, rank, and dignity.

Chapter Nine "He Did Not Deserve the Habit He Wore": Between Papacy and Empire

1. The Transfer of the Council

On 26 August 1545 Paul III enfeoffed his son Pier Luigi Farnese with the territories of Piacenza and Parma, formerly Milanese lands annexed to the Papal States by his predecessor Julius II. The political balance was overturned, since the investiture concerned a strategically crucial territory troubled by long-standing conflicts among feudal lords, secular and ecclesiastical seigneurs, and landowners, conflicts that would unleash endless legal disputes. 1 Moreover, because it had been carried out at the Church's expense, the decision was regarded as intolerable at the court of Charles V. The emperor saw the pontiff's diktat as a grave disturbance of the Italian balance of power, a military danger to the State of Milan, a threat to the imminent convocation of the council, and a source of scandal to the entire Protestant world, indignant at this outburst of shameless nepotism, which silenced every hope or illusion of Church reform.

Gian Pietro Carafa chose to stay away from the second consistory of August 1545, in which the pope requested the approval of the Sacred College. Paul III pleaded the difficulty of protecting the two cities and the greater revenues of the duchies of Nepi and Camerino that would be given in exchange. The latter had been wrested from the Varano family in 1539 and entrusted to Pier Luigi's son and designated successor, Ottavio, who the previous year had been appointed prefect of Rome. 2 Ercole Gonzaga, a fierce opponent of the Farnese pope, was nothing short of furious. In a letter to his cousin, the duke of Ferrara, he denounced the "grand arguments chewed over in two hours, [...] so clumsy that it is almost shameful to mention them," with which the pontiff had presented his decision in consistory. "The good old man is wallowing in the world, happier than ever," he raged. "To those of us who, without such good fortune, have inherited states won by our ancestors with so much toil and hardship and preserve them with just as much anguish, it seems a strange thing to see a man made duke of two such cities overnight, like a mushroom springing up." 3

On that occasion, however, the cohesion of the pro-imperial party seemed to fracture. The cardinal of Mantua sent Pole a request for explanations, since his failure to speak on the question of the Farnese state appeared a culpable acquiescence. 4 Moreover, indifferent to criticism, among the four new cardinals designated at the consistory of 16 December the pontiff did not hesitate to include his fifteen-year-old grandson Ranuccio Farnese. Shortly afterward Morone congratulated him on his transfer to the titular church

of Sant'Angelo in Pescheria. 5 As Gigliola Fragnito has suggested, the spirituali's tacit consent to the enfeoffment of Parma and Piacenza may have stemmed from their scant interest in temporal questions and in the fortunes of the Papal States. Contarini had already made this position explicit in 1529, when he was Venetian ambassador to Clement VII, and reaffirmed it in a conversation with Charles V in 1541. In the heated August consistory of 1545, it was restated by his right-hand man at Regensburg, Tommaso Badia, who declared himself in favor of dismembering the papal lands for the Farnese family's benefit. 6

It is therefore possible that Paul III's support for the spirituali, clearly displayed in the summer of 1542 when the cardinal appointments of Morone, Cortese, and Badia seemed to counterbalance the creation of the Roman Holy Office, arose not only from the pope's desire to restrain the inquisitors7 - as became evident in Carnesecchi's extrajudicial absolution in 15468 - but also from their indifference to the fate of the Church's temporal dominions. This proximity between spiritual and Farnese interests, although arising from wholly divergent premises, may help explain why, on the eve of his death, Paul III urged his nephews to support Reginald Pole's candidacy,9 convinced that it would pose no threat to the small Po Valley duchy. What emerges above all, however, is the extraordinary ability of the old pontiff to maneuver with consummate cunning through the labyrinth of Italian politics, to act with great unscrupulousness between the interests of the Church and the ambitions of his house, and to stretch the rope to breaking point while almost always prevailing. As we have seen, he had acted in the same way on the German front, where he managed to extricate himself from the trap of the religious colloquies and finally secure a council to be celebrated on the Italian side of the Alps.

Morone's uneasiness finds indirect confirmation in a letter Pole sent him on 24 October 1545, while at Trent awaiting the synod's imminent opening. Pole sought to console him for "some mist of sadness" that at times enveloped him, reminding him in Valdesian language that "God the Father never permits such darkness except to infuse greater light." 10 What drew him away from his discontent, however, was the letter Alessandro Farnese wrote him in late November summoning him to Rome with the utmost urgency in view of the Council of Trent's imminent opening. Farnese reminded him that "His Holiness esteems very highly the counsel and prudence of Your Most Reverend Lordship" and that his presence was "all the more timely and necessary because he knows that, regarding the affairs of Germany that must be discussed, he has no one here even moderately, much less fully, informed to the same degree as you." 11

The assembly of bishops formally opened at Trent on 13 December under the presidency of Cervini, Del Monte, and Pole. The legate of Bologna - positioned halfway between Rome and Trent - maintained an epistolary exchange with them on religious as well as political matters. 12 The goal for which he had long struggled, in Germany as in Rome, at last seemed to have been achieved. "Now that the world can no longer excuse itself by saying that Our Lord is not acting in earnest," he wrote exultantly to the Tridentine legates on 20 December, "I shall believe that the other princes too cannot fail in their duty." He announced that he would depart for Rome "immediately after Epiphany." 13 Gualteruzzi in Rome knew that Morone had been "summoned by Our Lord to consult with him on the affairs of Germany." 14 For almost all of 1546, a year that opened with Luther's death on 18 February, the Milanese cardinal followed the council's work from the papal curia while retaining his Bolognese office and remaining in constant contact with the Senate through its ambassadors in Rome. 15 After the many proofs he had given of his abilities, his prestige in the curia was now very high. This was attested even by Marcello Cervini, though aligned with the pro-French camp, who in a letter of 6 March that year presented him to Guglielmo Sirleto as a "virtuous and upright prelate, worthy of being known." 16

The increasingly explosive tension between Paul III's conciliar policy, aimed at a prompt condemnation of Protestant heresies while postponing Church reform to better times, and that of Charles V, who instead gave priority to reform and hoped for moderately worded doctrinal decrees that might facilitate agreement with the Protestants, could not fail to involve Morone personally. His double loyalty to Church and Empire risked being thrown into crisis, indeed torn apart, if the conflict between papacy and Empire reached breaking point. Yet on 23 June 1546 Charles V and Paul III signed an agreement by which the pontiff undertook to send a military contingent of 12,000 men to Germany and help finance a major campaign

against the Protestants. Arms once more had the final word, and every attempt at doctrinal agreement now appeared dead.

The diet held at Regensburg that year achieved nothing, since the emperor - disappointed by previous experiences and strengthened by his papal alliance - was already preparing the war that would bring him the great victory of Mühlberg the following year. Writing from the diet to the Milanese cardinal on 22 February, Johannes Cochlaeus declared himself convinced that the longer action was delayed, the less hope there would be of reaching any religious agreement. He recalled the calumnies heaped upon Contarini in 1542, both for the positions he had upheld at Regensburg and for his alleged role in covering Ochino's escape. 17 The controversial Tridentine decision to proceed in parallel with the formulation of doctrinal and reform decrees nevertheless seemed an acceptable compromise. As Cervini wrote to Morone on 29 January, "reform is so desired by everyone and so little believed in that a good part of these prelates wished to begin the council with it, lest it slip from their hands." 18

Common action between pope and emperor was nevertheless destined to be short-lived, leaving behind a tangle of resentments and frustrations. The first obstacle was the article on justification, the crucial point of disagreement between Catholics and Protestants. Discussion was consequently very tense both at Trent19 and in Rome. There, in May 1546, the conciliar congregation suspended judgment on a draft decree so that it could also hear the opinion of Morone, who was temporarily absent. 20 In April, moreover, in a letter that concealed all the persons named in it under pseudonyms, he solicited news from Trent "so as not to seem to go begging for information here." 21 This was a crucial question, laden with controversy, hostility, and resentment, whose especially crude and aggressive champion was Grechetto. On 25 June 1546 he sent Cardinal Farnese one of his snarling letters denouncing the heretics and suspects he saw proliferating everywhere, beginning with "that wicked seed of the late bishop of Verona" and the Augustinian friars, all supporters of the Lutheran *sola fide*. 22

> Even the general [Girolamo Seripando] *est huius opinionis* [is of this opinion], as are all his friars wherever they preach; and those who do not preach sow these and other tares throughout the world in familiar conversation, following their sacrilegious unfrocked friar Martin Luther, who was one of their own. [...] Contarini held this opinion; Morone holds it now, as do Ridolfi, Pole, and the bishops present here.

The council was thus threatened by a genuine heterodox "league" led by the cardinal of England. "Care must therefore be taken, when legates are sent, that they are Catholic and intelligent," Grechetto insisted, and sending Morone to Trent in that capacity would have been an error "worse than the first." On 2 August he again attacked Sanfelice, Pole, Vergerio, Contarini "now dead," and once more Morone, whom Rome was considering appointing as conciliar legate in place of the English cardinal. 23

On 13 January 1547 the council approved the decree on justification, framed in such a way as to condemn Protestant doctrine irrevocably and thus wholly disregard Charles V's hopes. With it the emperor saw every possibility of agreement with the Lutheran princes vanish. Someone said that Cervini had succeeded in carrying out "the finest trick ever played," strengthening the emperor's intention to have him deposed if he were elected pope, "knowing that he was no Christian." 24 A few years later Paolo Giovio rejoiced at the danger escaped, recalling Paul III's fears at the mere sound of "the horrible whistle of grace, so pleasing to Cardinal Contarini and smiling Morone," thereby showing himself aware of the latter's religious inclinations. 25 To avoid denying his own faith by signing the canon, Pole had preferred some time earlier to leave Trent on the pretext of an imaginary illness, while in Rome Morone tried until the last moment to prevent the decree's publication. 26 All the members of the cardinalitial commission declared themselves in favor except him. As the Spanish ambassador reported, he pointed out the many difficulties that would follow from it. 27 Paul III, however, was immovable. The emperor, he argued, must accept the decree as it stood or assume responsibility for suspending the council's work. The pope made no secret of his irritation with the opposing cardinals, among them Pole, Crescenzi, Morone, and Cortese. 28 There can be no doubt that the positions taken by Morone and Pole in consistory, together with the latter's withdrawal from Trent, fed Carafa's hostility, always ready to see in their political stances confirmation of the heresies they supposedly followed.

Having secured this success, and fearful of the direction the synod might take if the Habsburg armies defeated the Protestant princes, Paul III sought to rid himself as quickly as possible of an assembly that threatened unwelcome reforms and risked falling under Charles V's control. Alarmed by the emperor's growing strength, he missed no opportunity to place obstacles in his way. First he withdrew the troops and money he had granted him for the war against the Schmalkaldic League; then, two weeks before the decisive battle, under the pretext of an alleged outbreak of plague threatening Trent, he transferred the council to Bologna, within the Papal States. 29 Charles V's fury against the aged pontiff knew no bounds. From that point on he saw in him only a traitor with whom he would never again be reconciled. While curial prelates hurried to leave Trent, the papal legates appeared in Bologna as early as 20 March. 30 Yet by that date very few fathers had reached the Emilian city, in part because Charles V had ordered the bishops and theologians from the Spanish kingdoms to remain at Trent in a theatrical act of disobedience to the pope. It was in this climate of uncertainty that, between late March and April, some seventy bishops began the first Bolognese discussions.

Shortly afterward, however, the great victory on the battlefield of Mühlberg on 24 April 1547, immortalized in a celebrated painting by Titian, placed Germany at Charles V's feet. His power seemed all the greater because he had recently learned of the death of his most formidable rival, Francis I of Valois, who died at the age of fifty-three on 31 March. 31 This too helps explain why the emperor seemed determined to use all his strength to bend the Protestants through the Interim announced at the close of the Diet of Augsburg and proclaimed in May of the following year. The measure nevertheless included important concessions, such as clerical marriage and communion for the laity *sub utraque specie* [under both kinds]. That military triumph and the new political situation gave fresh force to imperial demands that the pope return the assembly to Trent, while also drawing attention to the danger of schism should the papal see fall vacant.

This prompted Paul III to draw closer to France, seeking the dispatch of French bishops to Bologna and thereby strengthening that fragment of the council, which began discussing the sacraments, indulgences, and purgatory - doctrines, liturgical practices, and devotional forms at the heart of the rupture with the Reformed world. As was clear in Bologna as well as Rome, however, continuing the proceedings, and above all issuing decrees without an adequate number of bishops, raised serious questions of legitimacy and risked deepening still further the breach between pontiff and emperor. Tension remained extremely high, to the point that Charles V did not hesitate to expel the nuncio Girolamo Verallo from his presence, shouting that he would "no longer believe the pope's words," the words of an obstinate old man who thought only of the greatness of the Farnese family. 32

Hence the slow dragging on of the proceedings through inconclusive discussions. "The affair goes on so endlessly and without purpose that everyone laughs at it, knowing that this is not doing anything but merely making a show of doing it," the Dominican Girolamo Papino wrote to the Este duke on 17 November 1547. Papino was then about to receive a disputed appointment as inquisitor of Ferrara, and shortly afterward added that "nothing whatever is done at the council except making a show that there is a council." 33 Clear proof was offered by the discussions "about abuses, but these abuses concern the wearing of rochets, the trimming of beards, and similar trifles that neither harm nor help Christian life," he insisted on 1 December. "The serious abuses are never discussed." 34 Among the fathers who remained faithful to Roman directives, fear that the synod would soon be dissolved thus became increasingly widespread.

It is significant that in July 1547 Rome considered sending Morone himself as nuncio or legate to the Diet of Augsburg,35 perhaps with the aim of convincing Charles V that the council should be closed. The emperor, however, was by no means willing to accept this, as he wrote to Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza on 23 August. If it happened, he would not limit himself to protesting, but would make every effort to convoke another council, laying blame upon those responsible for the damage and scandal arising from the pope's disastrous decisions and finally providing for serious reform of the Church at both the base and summit of its hierarchy. 36 This was a possibility that, although in very different terms, Morone did not exclude. In May 1547 he told Paul III plainly that the pope had no choice except either to break definitively

with the emperor or "to transfer the council to Germany, if that would cause a good council to be held [...] and provided that the power to elect the pope always remained with the apostolic see when vacant." 37

During intense debates held in Rome from 17 to 20 July, however, nearly all the cardinals declared themselves opposed to returning the council to Trent, except in the highly improbable event that the assembly itself should vote to do so. Morone alone raised a dissenting voice, convinced that this was the only way to avoid the dissolution of the council, with all the foreseeable consequences that would follow.

The dispatch of Francesco Sfondrati to the Diet of Augsburg to assist Girolamo Verallo as nuncio to the imperial court produced no result, leading the Florentine envoy to observe that not even a dog "barked in their direction." 38 For a moment the interruption of every diplomatic channel seemed to induce Alessandro Farnese to accept the reunification of the council as the only way out of the crisis. "We say here that whoever broke the glass must pay for it," he wrote to the legates on 20 August, alluding to Cervini. The latter, however, had little wish to become the affair's scapegoat or bear responsibility for the dead end into which it had fallen. "We do not know of any glass we are bound to pay for," he replied sharply to Bernardino Maffei, "unless it be for having, as was our duty, preserved the council in obedience to His Holiness and the apostolic see." 39

Meanwhile, still in August 1547, the Milanese cardinal was charged with drafting the lengthy memorial intended to provide Sfondrati with a kind of catalogue of answers to the imperial positions as they had emerged from the Roman discussions. First of all, it was necessary to safeguard the dignity and decision-making autonomy of the council itself, and therefore to commend as "true, appropriate, and necessary" Paul III's position that an authoritative order to return to Trent would "deprive the assembly of authority" and strip it of all "freedom."

Beyond the matter of principle, however, political considerations above all should have convinced Charles V of the futility of that path. No one could delude himself that the victory of Mühlberg would put an end to Lutheran "contumacy," "since it is clear that of their own will they do not wish to obey the decrees of a legitimate council," and force would therefore always be required to compel them. Instead, they had to be convinced of the need to negotiate their positions even on theological ground and thus to participate in the council. 40 Only after they had shown this intention through "evident and certain signs" could they be admitted to the episcopal assembly. Once again, therefore, he proposed a strategy of confrontation and agreement - the only one, moreover, capable of releasing him from the political anguish and conflicting loyalties in which he was then trapped. "I say this neither out of weakness of spirit nor to please any person," he cautiously wrote in an opinion of 9 September 1547, "but solely from true conscience and desire for the public good." 41

Toward the end of the summer several arrivals - including that of Seripando - and above all French promises raised hopes that a number of prelates sufficient to approve the canons, discussion of which had ended in late August, might be assembled. These hopes were also strengthened by the marriage contract between another son of Pier Luigi Farnese, Orazio - conveniently endowed with the duchy of Castro - and Diane de Valois, natural daughter of the new king Henry II. Yet when the fathers met in general congregation on 14 September in the presence of the French ambassador Claude d'Urfé, Del Monte recalled the many difficulties arguing against holding the session the following day. These included the arrival of only two French bishops and the very recent murder of the duke of Parma and Piacenza.

It was clear to everyone that formally approving doctrinal decrees at Bologna would bring about a final rupture, which in Morone's judgment Charles V himself did not desire and which in any case would "bring infinite harm and ruin upon public and private affairs." 42 The congregation was adjourned to a date to be set *ad beneplacitum concilii* [at the council's pleasure], while the discussions on the sacraments dragged on with ever greater weariness. In those circumstances the Milanese cardinal regarded as acceptable the hypothesis formulated by the two legates, even though it reproduced the disappointing model of the religious colloquies of the early 1540s: to suspend the council de facto "for one or two years, carrying out the general reform at present," and to address German questions through a "colloquy of certain chosen prelates with one or two" papal legates, which "would have almost the efficacy of a council." It was pure illusion, however, to think

that the strategy attempted at Regensburg in 1541 was still practicable at that date, and still more so the spirit in which Morone himself had experienced it beside Contarini. 43

The sharpening conflict between pope and emperor was plainly placing Morone in ever greater difficulty. He belonged to a cardinalitial commission within which Cardinal Cortese observed that the imperial party would never believe "that the council in Bologna is not, as it were, in Our Lord's power." 44 It is therefore significant that on 12 September Alessandro Farnese wrote to him from Perugia, shortly before Morone's hasty departure from Rome for Bologna,45 asking for his opinion not only on curial discussions but above all on general political matters. He urged him "always to state his view freely," because the pontiff "takes pleasure in his judgment as prudent and affectionate." 46 Morone's personal prestige and the respect accorded his diplomatic instinct therefore remained unchanged in Paul III's eyes. Within the commission, however, political tension had now passed the danger point.

It was probably then, for example, during an altercation in the residence of the dean of the College of Cardinals, Giovanni Domenico De Cupis, that an enraged Carafa could not restrain himself from insulting Morone, saying that he "did not deserve the habit he wore." Morone replied curtly that "those who knew more than he did had judged him worthy of it." 47 According to some, on this occasion the Theatine cardinal even reproached his Milanese colleague with "his father's arrival at the Sack of Rome, telling him that for this reason he was unworthy of the red hat." 48 On 12 August 1547 the Mantuan agent Ippolito Capilupi informed Ferrante Gonzaga of the "quarrel" between the two cardinals as follows:49

> While the transfer of the council was being discussed, Morone said that it seemed to him no decision should be taken without the participation and consent of His Majesty. Chieti thought Morone thereby showed himself partisan and that he cared more for His Majesty's greatness than for the good of the apostolic see. He therefore began to oppose his opinion by way of rebuke, saying that he ought to remember the habit he wore and that it was unbecoming for a man like him, endowed with so many virtues, to give himself into another's service. He spoke at some length in this manner. Cardinal Morone remained silent until it was his turn to speak - for, as you know, they give their votes in order. When his turn came, he gave his vote and then added that he recognized no lord other than His Holiness and the apostolic see, and that what he said proceeded not from passion of spirit but from zeal for the common good. Chieti, seeing that Morone had taken offense, skillfully spoke at length in his praise and almost asked pardon for what he had previously said against him.

2. The Murder of Pier Luigi Farnese and the Occupation of Piacenza

After the transfer of the council to Bologna, experienced as an ignominious betrayal, Charles V chose the path of a terrible retaliation intended to strike at the very heart of the pope's affections and interests. Meanwhile his most faithful supporters in Italy began to hope that he was at last about to turn against Rome and assume leadership of Christendom. To some, this prospect appeared on the verge of realization with the murder of Pier Luigi Farnese, carried out at Piacenza on 10 September 1547 and immediately recognized as the work of the imperial party.

Ferrante Gonzaga was then promoting an ambitious policy along the traditional lines of expansion of the State of Milan. It led him to plan the conquest of Bellinzona, the subjection of Chiavenna and the Valtellina to imperial authority, and even the seizure from Venice of the mainland cities nearest the Milanese duchy, including Brescia, Crema, and Bergamo. Charles V had to intervene repeatedly to urge prudence upon him, especially in relations with the Venetian Republic, without, however, restricting his plans for aggressive defense of Habsburg interests in northern Italy. This was the background to his intervention in the question of Parma and Piacenza. He feared that the Farnese coup would bring the two cities under French influence, as suggested by Pier Luigi Farnese's assistance to Francis I's troops in the campaign of 1544 and, in 1547, by rumors that he had been involved in the Fieschi conspiracy at Genoa, another area where Gonzaga believed the emperor should strengthen his rule.

Having obtained Charles V's consent, on condition that the duke not be killed, Don Ferrante began contacting Piacentine nobles in April 1547 to organize a conspiracy that ultimately culminated in the deadly

assault of 10 September. Two days later his troops entered Piacenza and occupied its territory as far as the Taro, while the duchy was annexed to the State of Milan.

Crushed by the loss of his son, Paul III nevertheless held firm "bravely, like a rock against the waves of the sea," Giovanni Bianchetti wrote to Monsignor Della Casa, reporting the "great outburst" he had directed at the Spanish ambassador, Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. The pope had told him that as a man he might forgive, but as pontiff he "could not and would not give away the honor of the Church to anyone in the world." A few weeks later the pope remained "so deeply wounded and grief-stricken that he would not listen to anyone who did not speak of war and blood." 50 Naturally there were those who fanned the flames, such as Carafa, who in consistory "said a mountain of things against the murderers and, exaggerating, began to describe the outrage and disgrace done to the corpse." His behavior even justified the suspicion that he wished "to cause anguish and pain to this poor old man; and as far as he was able, he spurred His Holiness toward vengeance." 51 Rome even feared an invasion of the Papal States. On 13 September, as soon as he learned of his son's murder, the pope ordered Morone to return to his legation,52 to assist Del Monte in the management of the crisis, which above all required financial resources to help strengthen the Parma garrison. 53 Once recovered from gout,54 he was able to leave in great haste on the fifteenth to "do his part" in Bologna, where he arrived on the nineteenth. 55 *Missus ex Urbe a pontifice ob praesentes rerum novitates et turbationes* [sent from Rome by the pontiff because of the present upheavals and disturbances],56 he was immediately charged with transferring the cannon then in the city to Parma and replacing them with others brought from Ancona. 57

Shortly before, on 6 July, Cardinal Gian Angelo de' Medici had taken office in Bologna as governor. His family had long been joined to Morone's by a solid alliance. 58 The future pope had meanwhile advanced far. His brother Gian Giacomo had married Marzia Orsini, Pier Luigi Farnese's sister-in-law; his sisters had married scions of the Borromeo and Sittich von Hohenems families, Austrian nobles who would later Italianize their surname as Altemps. These family connections had accelerated Medici's career. He first obtained appointment as archbishop of Ragusa in Dalmatia and then the post of commissioner general under Alessandro and Ottavio Farnese, respectively legate and commander-in-chief of the papal troops sent to Charles V in support of the war against the Schmalkaldic League. 59 Some contemporary observers and the earliest historians of these events perceived risks of conflict in the simultaneous presence of the two Milanese cardinals in Bologna, perhaps also in order retrospectively to distance the two prelates because of the "embarrassment" caused by Morone's later inquisitorial troubles. 60 A seventeenth-century compilation, for example, states that Medici "often obstructed the decisions and plans of Cardinal Giovanni Morone, the legate, with the pontiff's consent." 61

In reality, the ties and collaborative commitment between the two cardinals remained firm, although in that convulsive September of 1547 Medici's growing power is evident. He would soon cease to be styled governor and appear instead as vice-legate in Massarelli's diary. 62 Equally evident, however, was the difficult moment Morone had to confront, and with him all the imperialists, to the point that the Habsburg ambassador in Rome believed even Ferrante Gonzaga, Charles V's plenipotentiary in Italy, should fear for his life. 63 In the weeks following Pier Luigi Farnese's death, the Milanese cardinal was called upon to face all the dangers involved in governing a highly unstable area, while his own political role became steadily weaker. He must immediately have grasped this, since as early as 24 September 1547 he gave Bernardino Maffei a realistic picture of the Bolognese situation and the atmosphere of hostility in which he had to operate. It led him to request the dispatch of "a legate of greater weight" and with military experience, naming Cardinal Del Monte, already present there. 64 On the same day he also informed Alessandro Farnese of the powerful anti-papal winds blowing from Milan, where "it is publicly said that they wish to wage war on the priests and destroy them," while "signs of dissatisfaction" with the pope multiplied. 65

As Ferrante Gonzaga organized his network of spies, rumors spread that the Bentivoglio were preparing to lead an uprising to "turn Bologna against the pope" and hand it over to Charles V. The governor of Milan wrote to the emperor on 26 October 1547 urging him not to reject the plan, but rather "by every means to keep it alive and, as the saying goes, up one's sleeve, to use at the proper time; and at the proper time it will

always be possible to cut it off without any harm to Your Majesty." 66 The emperor did not approve the scheme,67 though he would consider it in 1548 after learning of Farnese dealings with the king of France. 68

The rising tide of events caught Morone in the very predicament of which he had already been accused in Germany69 and during the transfer of the council: being at once Paul III's cardinal and "an imperialist and the son of an imperialist," as the French ambassador Claude d'Urfé called him on 9 July 1548. 70 It was then that Don Ferrante's military action and, more generally, the mounting political instability created by the imminent death of the decrepit Paul III71 became entangled with the already intricate web of roles, loyalties, and duties entrusted to Morone in previous years; with a personal temperament and political-religious culture incompatible with uncritical adherence to factions, cliques, or interests; and with his own social origins, which exposed him more than other pro-Habsburg members of the Sacred College to the fluctuating fortunes of the exercise of power.

The Milanese cardinal risked paying dearly for being regarded by the opposing camps with the same distrust that Don Diego de Mendoza, at the end of October 1547, urged Charles V to show toward the entire Sacred College - "the holiest of the cardinals," he wrote, "is a wicked man" - and toward Morone in particular, whom he called a "dissembler like the devil." This was all the more serious in view of the deep rivalries dividing the imperial party, whose concord he thought more difficult to achieve than turning oil into vinegar. 72 The exceptionally shrewd Spanish ambassador offered a judgment as severe as it was unjust, partly shared by Paul III. 73 The pope nevertheless continued regularly to consult the Milanese cardinal on the burning questions of the council and Piacenza, which had reached a deadlock. The emperor was prepared to discuss returning the city only after the synod had first reunited at Trent, while the pontiff was prepared to discuss the council only after the city had first been restored to the Farnese. 74

On 14 December, when sending the cardinal-nephew the "discourse" requested from him on the matter - which proved "most pleasing" to the pope - Morone apologized in advance should he have written anything that "offended your mind or that of Our Lord," asking him to attribute it "only to a defect of judgment and not to any evil intention in my spirit." He did not pronounce on the imperial proposal, since the lost draft response of the commission already said far too much about it, "and to write it all out, besides being too long, is also dangerous." With a frankness equal to his political intelligence, the legate of Bologna observed that referring the decision to the council amounted to nothing less than a rejection of the imperial request, "because it is sufficiently clear that the greater part of these prelates will not consent," quite apart from the fact that Charles V had never recognized the legitimacy of the Bolognese assembly.

There was thus a risk that "the despair of Germany and a rupture with His Majesty would follow," producing the "total ruin of the apostolic see and of Italy and perhaps of Christendom, besides the offense that would be done to God by abandoning that province after so many efforts and expenses on the part of these two princes, and besides the scandal that might follow throughout the world." By contrast, little would be risked by returning to Trent, where the remaining prelates - mostly Italian and Spanish - were almost all "good Catholics" and neither could nor would "do anything essential against us in dogma and religion or against the authority of Our Lord." As a secondary course, he suggested guaranteeing the emperor the full freedom of the Bolognese synod and then having the assembly itself vote to return to Trent, thereby gaining some time.

As for the imperial demand that an energetic reform of the Church finally begin, the Milanese cardinal observed without reticence that "nothing more need be said, except that in order finally to achieve some effect it might be well, even without the council, to begin carrying out some of those measures that are most notorious and have no excuse other than bad custom, if indeed there is any excuse at all." Finally, regarding the possibility of a conclave "while affairs remain in this state of distrust," only a return to Trent would make possible an agreement that was absolutely indispensable, he concluded, declaring himself convinced "that no greater evil could befall Christendom than a schism." 75

In this way he in effect sided with Charles V's arguments, while not failing to indicate to the pontiff his duty as supreme head of the Church. He did so with his proven capacity to grasp the central points of a problem, to move beyond formal questions and look to substance, to emphasize the great religious issues

underlying the legitimate stratagems of politics, and to recall his interlocutors to the responsibilities of their office.

Meanwhile at the imperial court - where the principle of treating the problem of the council and the question of Piacenza separately was never abandoned - a decision matured to make one final attempt to return the assembly to Trent. Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo was sent to Rome furnished with meticulous instructions,76 dated at Augsburg on 10 November, demanding the council's immediate return to the seat previously agreed. Failing this, Charles V's ambassadors were to deliver a formal act of protest to the pope. The cardinal of Trent immediately set out. By 9 December, as Farnese wrote to Morone that very day, he had conveyed the imperial demands, asking that the conciliar congregation not respond at once in formal terms. Yet that is precisely what happened five days later, when the demands were presented again by Mendoza. With only the pro-imperial cardinals Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, Reginald Pole, Juan Álvarez de Toledo, and Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla opposing, the decision was taken to refer the matter to the council fathers assembled at Bologna. 77

A letter Massarelli sent Cervini on Christmas Eve gives a glimpse into the Milanese cardinal's thoughts in those days after a conversation with Madruzzo's secretary, Aurelio Cattaneo of Milan, who passed through Bologna on his return journey from Rome. 78 Cattaneo had expressed deep pessimism about what would follow if Paul III did not send the council back to Trent, saying that the situation was "only less bad than hell" and that "both schism and war were bound to follow," because Charles V would continue along his own path as far as a formal protest, while the council would meanwhile proceed - with or without the pope - in the seat originally established.

"And when the Most Reverend Monsignor Morone told him that he could not believe, given His Majesty's piety and Catholic mind, that he would wish to be the cause of schism, a thing so pernicious in the Church of God, Messer Aurelio replied that His Majesty was being forced to do so, because His Beatitude had not provided the remedy that had been hoped for." Even when Morone voiced doubts about the possibility of war, convinced that "His Majesty would be heavily occupied in Germany and elsewhere," Cattaneo replied "that the emperor, *solo nutu et solo verbo* [by a nod and a word alone], could wage whatever war he wished, since he had nothing to fear from Germany, having subjected it," and that good relations with the new king of France foreshadowed "a very great war" in Italy: "And all because they do not wish to send the council back to Trent."

On the affairs of Piacenza, the Milanese cardinal expressed astonishment that the emperor not only failed to return it to the Farnese, "as is right," but did not even speak of it, dissembling "as though nothing had happened," while at the same time insisting with great firmness upon the council's return to Trent. This was impossible for the pontiff unless the question of the Farnese state was first resolved. The positions were opposed, although Morone expressed the hope "that His Holiness would not regard private interest - even though Piacenza was also a public interest - if he judged that sending the council back to Trent was expedient for the public benefit of Christendom." 79 This was a cautious way of proposing the only possible compromise. The general interest suggested "sending the council back to Trent" - that was the fundamental point concerning the entire Church - and it was therefore best to forget every point of pride and abandon little Piacenza to its Farnese fate.

The Milanese cardinal's fears were destined to come true within a few days, as he wrote with prophetic pessimism in a letter to Madruzzo on 23 January. Among other things, he regretted being unable to come to Rome to help him "pour on water and extinguish the fire as far as possible":80

> I am deeply troubled and pray that God will lay His hand upon this. It seems too horrible to contemplate the disorders that would come upon Christendom if a rupture occurred between these two princes. I trust that the goodness and great prudence of His Majesty will give the matter much consideration, because such a dance might begin that it would end neither in our days nor in another age of our descendants, as has been seen before in other schisms. Beginning it seems easy; ending it is not within the power of men.

Naturally the pontiff, more sensitive to Piacenza than to the council, did not follow Morone's advice. The situation finally collapsed with the solemn protest pronounced at Bologna before the episcopal assembly by

Francisco Vargas on 16 January 1548 and, a week later in Rome before the consistory, by Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. 81 Even before the pope decreed its formal suspension, the council dissolved ingloriously, the bishops leaving Bologna one by one, "in haste," as Fra Girolamo Papino wrote to Ferrara. 82

Throughout those convulsive weeks Morone continued to inform the Farnese of reports received from several quarters about agreements being forged between the Bentivoglio and Don Ferrante,83 as well as the plans of Ippolito da Correggio, lord of the strategically placed Po Valley county, who styled himself a "servant of the emperor" and would therefore be quite pleased, if asked, to do "something ugly against His Holiness." 84 Morone knew well that in the event of a rupture between the pope and Charles V, "which God forbid, the first blow will fall upon Bologna," as he wrote on 9 February. 85 He therefore followed the movements of Don Diego de Mendoza and Ferrante Gonzaga and became alarmed at news of their meeting at Piacenza while the city was under imperial occupation. He questioned Spanish captains arriving from Augsburg to learn the latest news from the Habsburg court, and tried to "clip the wings" of the Bentivoglio in order to keep the Bolognese nobility under control.

The letters he sent Alessandro Farnese between June and October show that in this crisis he acted as the pope's spokesman to Camillo Orsini - the Roman baron to whom Paul III had entrusted the defense of what remained of the Farnese duchy after his son's murder - in order to promote by every means the military reinforcement of Parma and Bologna and avoid being "taken by surprise" by Charles V's troops. "I have used and continue to use every diligence," he wrote on 17 February 1548, "to learn the actions of our neighbors, and we shall remain as vigilant as possible. But I again beg that provision be made for money here and at Parma; otherwise, be certain that some great disorder will follow, of which we shall be able to do nothing but complain." 86

The conversation between Morone and Cattaneo caused some resentment because the latter insisted on meeting him alone. In particular, his choice to have no other interlocutors at such a delicate moment provoked the cutting perplexity of those not honored even with a visit, such as the only papal legate to the council still in the city, Cardinal Del Monte. On Christmas Day 1547 he wrote Cervini that he was indifferent to the gossip, though not without betraying his irritation: "I am old, gouty, poor, weary, and suspicious by nature. I hear whisperings and threats from this side and that, and nevertheless not a hair's breadth of fear can approach me. God grant this is not from my own folly and vanity." 87

The atmosphere surrounding Morone at the end of 1547 and the beginning of 1548, in short, grew heavier by the day. This is confirmed by the brutal words of the bishop of Belcastro, Giacomo Giacomelli, who had been hostile to the Milanese cardinal for personal reasons since the Tridentine legation of 1542-43 and would later become one of his bitter accusers. 88 Giacomelli went so far as to threaten the imperial procurator Francisco Vargas with death, wishing that "one night he might be thrown into a privy." 89 Despite Del Monte's attempts to minimize the affair, dismissing it as "a Roman outburst," the episode involved Morone, who assigned Vargas an armed guard. 90

Meanwhile, as Madruzzo kept the legate informed of the alarming outcome of the Diet of Augsburg,91 Alessandro Farnese received a malicious account of a meeting between Morone and the sacristan of the Sacred Palace, the Augustinian Giovan Giacomo Barba. Morone had allegedly complained about "certain prelates who speak very freely against Caesar, which they ought not to do," and received the sharp reply that those very criticisms showed "what the holy council can do and yet does not do." 92

The insinuations concerning the legate's disloyalty did not, at least outwardly, undermine the pope's confidence. He continued to entrust Morone with the city's security. The cardinal strengthened its defenses and surveillance, keeping a "good eye" upon it, as Cervini wrote to Rome in January and February 1548, fearful that from one moment to the next an attack by Ferrante Gonzaga might seize "the palace, establish a strong position within it, and proclaim liberty." 93 Cardinal Farnese therefore took care to recall the vice-legate Gian Angelo de' Medici to Bologna on his return from Parma and a few days later sent a guard of five hundred men. Meanwhile a papal brief ordered the presidents of the council, who had referred to Rome the decision whether to dissolve it, not to leave the city, which was said to have been offered to the emperor by certain conspirators. 94 At an exceptionally delicate moment, amid the crisis of Parma, the suspension

of the council, and with Paul III's inexorable old age, the Farnese seized the opportunity to settle accounts with old and new opponents, striking at Bologna's pro-imperial nobility through arrests, exile, and the seizure of fiefs. The moment was also approaching for the pro-Habsburg legate to leave the city, while astrologers - to whom Morone must have given some credence, as is shown by the survival of several horoscopes drawn up by Lattanzio Benazzi [95] - were predicting the death of a "great prelate": "Santa Croce is already out of danger, and the most reverend Morone eats once a day," the future Julius III noted on 19 February 1548, with some concern for himself. [96]

3. The End of the Legation

Gonzaga meanwhile continued to devise plans to consolidate imperial rule over Italy. Among other things, he envisaged ceding the Low Countries to Savoy through the marriage of Mary of Habsburg to Prince Emmanuel Philibert, who in turn would undertake to cede Piedmont to Charles V, thereby creating a vast state in the Po Valley subject to the Spanish monarchy, by then master of the entire western Mediterranean. [97] With Camillo Orsini's arrival in February 1548, Parma remained under papal control, and the situation did not change in the months that followed. In nearby Bologna, Morone was forced to negotiate between his two political loyalties, now in conflict with each other. Perhaps for this reason, in early April he was once again mentioned as a possible nuncio to Germany. [98] Yet the proposal was evidently deemed inappropriate when Charles V's determination to end the dialogue with Rome and act independently on the German political and religious front culminated in the Augsburg Interim, which Rome deplored.

In any event, on 18 May Morone sent Farnese and Cervini a new request to be relieved of the legation on serious grounds of health. [99] As early as September of the previous year, he had reported suffering from "intestinal pains and continuous fever." [100] For years the cardinal had relied on the advice of the celebrated Lombard physician Girolamo Cardano. One of Cardano's consultations - unfortunately undated, and perhaps from the 1560s - suggests that, in addition to gout, the still relatively young man, burdened for decades by heavy responsibilities, suffered from disorders of sleep, digestion, and the intestines. [101] Cardano would later recall that in 1546 the cardinal had proposed him as physician-in-chief to Paul III, [102] and that it was the "benefices" and "protection" of the "most learned Morone" that had persuaded him to move between Modena and Bologna, while retaining the goodwill of other cardinals. [103] The physician would later face an inquisitorial trial, which ended with a ban on the publication of his works and an obligation to reside in Rome. This comparatively mild outcome was influenced by the intercession of Madruzzo and Morone, who, after learning of the charges of heresy against the scholar, had advised him to leave his teaching post before his contract at the University of Bologna expired. [104]

The reasons for his request to be freed from the burden of the legation become clearer, beyond the stated health problems, if one recalls that it was submitted at a moment when the situation in the Farnese duchy seemed to leave no room for reconciliation, and only three days after the promulgation of the Augsburg Interim. [105] The measure made important concessions to the Protestants, prompting Carafa to call the emperor a "heretic" and a "schismatic." Morone's grave embarrassment is therefore understandable, since from the time of his German nunciatures he had supported those very concessions. [106] At the end of May 1548, Cervini presented the Milanese cardinal's new petition to the pope and reminded Paul III that Morone's financial circumstances were far from prosperous. "When His Holiness resolved to relieve Cardinal Morone of the legation, I did not fail to remind His Holiness of his needs, nor did I separate one request from the other," he wrote a few months later, adding that the pope had promised "to provide for him in every way." [107] Yet as late as 6 June the pontiff still appeared unwilling to allow Morone to relinquish the office. The cardinal of Santa Croce informed the legate that Paul III intended to wait another "few months, wishing in the meantime to provide for him so that he may maintain his rank, since I had already informed him of the meagreness of his income. To begin with, the abbey of La Cava" - later Cavatigozzi, near Cremona - "has been designated for him." [108] Don Ferrante Gonzaga also urged Charles V to provide Morone with some source of income. [109]

The revocation of the legation, however, took less time than the pope had suggested in that conversation. The news had already reached Bologna by 20 June, [110] and Morone rejoiced, although he was forced to

abandon the hope of receiving any substantial reward for his many services to the Holy See. His disappointment is evident from the fact that he set out for Modena, unable to maintain himself with proper dignity in Rome. [111] Alessandro Farnese's letter of 16 June, announcing that the office had been assigned to Del Monte, cautiously referred to "the desire Your Lordship has long had to be relieved of the burden of the legation, even though His Holiness, being entirely satisfied with your actions, had no intention of removing you." [112] In Bologna, Girolamo Papino knew of the matter by 24 June, when he wrote to Ferrara that the legate had been recalled to Rome, "released from the legation," adding that "those around the most reverend Morone say that the pope wishes to wage war and therefore removes Morone, who has the reputation of being imperial, and appoints Del Monte as a good churchman and Frenchman." He had received confirmation from letters written by Cervini, but on 10 July he reported that different instructions had arrived from Rome, with the result that "Morone has packed everything up and is remaining here for these two months," probably because it was feared that Charles V "would become angry if Del Monte were made legate of Bologna, since His Majesty is a bitter enemy of Del Monte." [113] Del Monte himself advised the Milanese cardinal, who agreed, not to leave office until he had received the papal brief of revocation. [114] That document undoubtedly arrived a few days later, for on 15 July Papino informed Ferrara that Morone, "having received confirmation of the new successor," had left that morning for Modena and would then proceed to Milan, "until, once the heat has passed, he can travel comfortably to Rome." [115]

Massarelli's diaries show that Morone attributed the sudden acceleration of his removal to pressure from the French cardinals. [116] It has already been noted that the transfer of the council had persuaded Paul III to restore good relations with the new king, Henry II of Valois. Henry had never done much to ensure the success of a council that risked benefiting above all his principal enemy, the emperor, and for that reason he had appointed as ambassador to the episcopal assembly a figure of no great standing, Claude d'Urfé. [117] While the prelates whom the late king had promised to send to Bologna continued to stay away, the murder of Pier Luigi Farnese provoked demands for intervention from the French party in Italy. The pope intended to deny Parma and Piacenza to Ottavio Farnese, Charles V's son-in-law, and instead bestow them on his younger brother Orazio, who a few months earlier had been betrothed to Diana of Valois, daughter of the king of France. [118] Morone was therefore not far from the truth when he confided to Massarelli his belief that the Farnese had eagerly seized upon his request to withdraw from the Bolognese legation in order to sacrifice him on the altar of a pro-French turn. In June 1548, Charles V's grand chancellor, Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle, was likewise informed by reports from Rome of rumours that "in the first consistory His Holiness would give the legation of Bologna to Cardinal Del Monte, since those Frenchmen were insisting that Cardinal Morone be removed from it, considering him too imperial and that city too important." [119] Finally, it is likely that the pope's decision was also connected to the dispute over possession of the benefices of the bishopric of Pavia. After Pier Luigi Farnese's death, the controversy divided Ferrante Gonzaga from an increasingly furious Del Monte, who had even been put on trial and deprived of the diocese so that it could be restored to Giovangirolamo de' Rossi, whom Paul III had deposed from the episcopal see in 1544. [120]

The tangled affair could be resolved only by appointing the future Julius III. On 16 June Cervini reported to him that the pope had said that, "since Monsignor Morone has for some time continued to request relief from the legation, he had thought of giving it to Your Most Reverend Lordship, judging that in this way provision would be made for your safety and security." [121] The new legate's thanks included a magnanimous thought for his predecessor, who in two letters to Cervini dated 21 and 23 June declared himself "overjoyed" to leave the office, but "very badly provided for and with extremely weak revenues." While he waited for Rome to remember him and his financial straits, all he could do - and not without uncertainty - was approach the Gonzaga in search of some income. [122] He remained papal legate until 3 July 1548 [123] and left Bologna on the fourteenth, after handing over his duties, while the city prepared festivities for his successor's entry into office. [124] Before taking the road that would lead him back to Milan, [125] Morone stopped for a few days in Modena, where, confirming his political isolation, Duke Ercole II did not trouble to receive him. [126] The duke had him told "that he was somewhat occupied and could not give him an audience," without even arranging for "one of his people to visit him or anything else." [127] As the son-in-law of the French king Louis XII, a

papal vassal, and a staunch opponent of the empire, the Este duke thus intended to make clear to the cardinal that the "pope's Italy" was not on his side.

It was in Modena that he received Alessandro Farnese's letter ending his legation and informing him of his successor's appointment. "There is nothing more to say on the matter," he replied tersely on 16 July, adding that he intended to return to Rome in September. [128] Thus ended a four-year period in which Girolamo Morone's son had tested himself in the temporal government of a city of crucial strategic importance in the Papal States, an office that required the ability to manoeuvre within precarious institutional balances and ancient civic traditions. The breadth of his responsibilities, his aptitude for diplomacy and for translating decisions into action, and his sensitivity to the personal relationships underpinning the exercise of power allowed him to leave a lasting mark on areas then undergoing profound reorganisation, such as civil legislation and, still more decisively, criminal justice. From this perspective, the Bolognese legation anticipated and prepared him for other duties of political government to which he would later be called. [129]

Not only the concrete exercise of office, but the Milanese prelate's entire life was profoundly conditioned by the interweaving of political and religious imperatives that reached their culmination precisely during the Bolognese legation. The events of those years forced him to redefine his role and his convictions: the sharpening conflict between empire and papacy, and the unrestrained nepotism of a pontiff whom he had served with great energy and loyalty but whose commitment to any genuine renewal of the Church he was forced to recognise as fragile; [130] the decline of the hopes for religious concord to which he had devoted himself as both nuncio and bishop; the first Tridentine decrees, which laid those hopes to rest; the rapid narrowing and eventual disappearance of any legitimate space for the doctrines he had learned in the school of the *spirituali*, steadily eroded by the irresistible rise of the Roman Holy Office and its power within the Curia; and, finally, the effective absorption and exhaustion of every reform project within the inquisitorial perspective.

In July 1548 Morone finally obtained "release from that office, so laborious and burdensome," as Reginald Pole wrote to him, rejoicing at his intention to return to Modena with "greater opportunity to attend to that legation [the government of the diocese], which is more important and brings greater consolation to the part of you that is more important." [131] It is therefore likely that Morone believed he would be kept away from the Roman Curia for the immediate future. This appeared to be indicated by his removal from the legation, the atmosphere of distrust he had experienced in Bologna in the months after the pope's son's death, and the rupture between Paul III and Charles V, sealed by the formal protest against the transfer of the Council of Trent and then by the Augsburg Interim. Unless, that is, what had happened was to be read as the prelude to further and graver repercussions awaiting him as the Farnese pontificate drew to a close. Everywhere, predictions were being made about the succession to the tiara, and lists of papabili passed from court to court, together with calculations dividing the cardinals into overlapping and competing factions: the "Paulines" created by the ageing pope, but also the "young" and the "old," the French and the imperialists, the intransigents and the reformers, the Venetian group and possible compromise candidates such as Giovanni Salviati. [132] Both Pole and Morone were regarded as pro-imperial reformers. Most judged the former "a holy man, but not [...] suited to so great a burden," "wholly devoted to study and spiritual matters," while the latter was thought "too young" for the papacy and "too much a servant of His Majesty." [133] It was in this tense and confused atmosphere, in the heat of July 1548, that Giovanni Morone left Bologna for Modena and his native Milan. He could not have suspected that within a few days he would have to return precipitately to papal territory, where he and his family would face grave danger from accusations capable of compromising his honour and threatening his very life. For that same summer of 1548, moreover, in the customary catalogue of disasters with which he filled his horoscopes, the astrologer Lattanzio Benazzi had foretold "adversities and troubles" for churchmen and, for the people of Bologna, "mortal illnesses, [...] discord, bloodshed, [...] murders, [...] burdens and injuries caused by superiors." [134]

4. "To Place Bologna in the Emperor's Hands": An Anti-Papal Conspirator?

During his years in Bologna the Milanese cardinal had housed several relatives. In Rome there was Giulio, the natural son of his brother Antonio, orphaned in 1536 and legitimised by an imperial diploma in 1554, [135] who, together with other members of the household, received lessons in Greek from the highly learned Guglielmo Sirleto, later a cardinal. Among the works read in 1546 were several by Gregory of Nazianzus, including an oration on love for the poor and another "in praise of Saint Cyprian." [136] In Bologna there was the husband of his sister Amabilia, Catalano Gallarati, whose surname was often shortened to "Galerà." Although he belonged to a prosperous family, the thirty-five-year-old brother-in-law, "tall and thin," had been forced by debt to leave Milan and seek refuge with the cardinal in Bologna, where he devoted himself chiefly to "going out with sparrowhawks and living delicately," though he had never served in war. [137] Such widespread low esteem may have caused Morone some embarrassment, created a few annoyances, and prompted the occasional reprimand, but apparently nothing more. He must therefore have been utterly astonished when, two weeks after leaving Bologna, he learned that the new legate had told Massarelli - even before writing to Rome - that Gallarati had tried to persuade the lieutenant of the light cavalry garrisoning the city to sell himself to Don Ferrante Gonzaga. [139] The bishop of Modena was therefore forced to hurry back into papal territory to face the political consequences of the recklessness of this improbable conspirator, suddenly seized by pro-imperial heroics and threatening to drag Morone's loyalty to the pope - already questioned by some because of his political orientation - through the mud.

Del Monte prepared a report on the affair, which was sent to Rome on 31 July. By mid-August Catalano was travelling there in Morone's company, unaware of what awaited him, while Alessandro Farnese warned the governor of Romagna that, should the two attempt to return to Lombardy, Gallarati was to be arrested without regard for rank or circumstance. [140] Deemed responsible for a conspiracy, he was imprisoned in Castel Sant'Angelo on 17 September, while the lieutenant who had accused him was summoned to Rome. [141] The prisoner's kinship with a cardinal, the recent events surrounding the Bolognese legation, and the continuing political tensions led the courts of the peninsula to follow the affair with the closest attention. That same day the future bishop of Fano, Ippolito Capilupi, agent of the duke of Mantua and formerly in Ferrante Gonzaga's service, described the unpleasant reception given to the Milanese cardinal in Rome. Farnese showed him Del Monte's letter revealing the details of the plan "to place Bologna in the emperor's power" with military assistance from Ferrante Gonzaga and Cosimo de' Medici, and then made him witness his brother-in-law's arrest. [142] "Morone belongs wholly to Signor Don Ferrante and to Your Most Illustrious Lordship," the Gonzaga agent added, implicitly suggesting what Gallarati's arrest meant in the eyes of most observers: an attack on the most exposed link of the imperial party within the Sacred College. On receiving the news, the cardinal of Mantua immediately passed it to his brother and urged him to press for a definitive break between their Milanese colleague and the papal Curia. "It has given me infinite pleasure to see Cardinal Morone's disposition toward us, for he is a man upon whom great reliance can be placed," he wrote on 28 September, adding that the time had come "to retain him not in Rome or by letters, but in Milan and through deeds, so that he may have all the more reason to distance himself from these people and draw closer to us." [143]

News of the arrest was immediately sent to Charles V by Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla on 25 September, [144] while in prison Gallarati confessed that he had "spoken of such matters" with the Bolognese captain, though only "in jest" or as an abstract possibility. The explanation was scarcely credible. His jailers consequently began inspecting the food sent to him from the cardinal's kitchens, fearing that Morone or Don Ferrante might have him poisoned to prevent him from "confessing what he knows." [145] The purely political fabric of the affair soon became apparent. Morone himself declared that he was convinced "the pope would like his brother-in-law to confess that it is true that Don Ferrante devised this madness, if he was mad enough to commit such an error, and that if he confessed this, everything would be well." [146] Capilupi wrote these words to Ercole Gonzaga on 8 October 1548, although two days earlier he had reported that Paul III did not appear to have lost confidence in Morone. Nor did he do so even when, after three days of harsh imprisonment, Gallarati, "having been taken to the rope and unwilling to wait for it," confessed that

he had met Ferrante Gonzaga in Mantua and that Gonzaga had told him "not to conclude anything, but to keep the negotiation alive." [147]

Alessandro Farnese nevertheless sought to reassure Morone that the pope's "good opinion" of him was so firm that "not the slightest suspicion could arise that you knew of it, even if there were some malicious person wishing to arouse such suspicion against you." [148] At the court in Brussels, meanwhile, it was believed that Gallarati's arrest "might have some foundation," since it was known that the governor of Milan had "attempted certain dealings in Bologna, although these gentlemen have never wished to heed them, and it is no wonder that Don Ferrante should allow himself to be carried away by the hatred he bears the house of Farnese." So Bernardo de' Medici wrote from the Habsburg court to the duke of Florence on 21 October 1548. A few days later he reported that Granvelle had sharply intervened with the pope to demand that all proceedings against Gallarati be halted, "because he is a worthy man, and so as not to stain his family and his many noble relatives; whatever he has confessed comes from torture and not from the truth." Otherwise, there would be brutal retaliation, with analogous proceedings brought against "persons of greater importance." [149]

Morone knew only too well the limits of papal reassurances. That same day the Gonzaga agent found him "deeply troubled," convinced "that Farnese has not told him everything." [150] Gallarati's accuser, the Bolognese captain Fioravanti Moreschi, who had been in the pope's service since 1547, [151] was far from reliable. The fact that in 1551 only Julius III's support would enable him to escape a ban imposed on him in Venice [152] is suggestive; he then resumed service in Bologna throughout the 1550s. [153] The governor of Rome regarded him as "a scoundrel who has committed a thousand wicked deeds," while the common opinion of Gallarati was that he was "a brute." [154] "It is believed that, because he is poor and heavily burdened by a family, he conceived this foolish scheme in hopes of being rewarded," Gualteruzzi wrote to Della Casa on 13 October 1548. [155]

Even in the summer of the following year, when a pamphlet entitled *Letter of Friar Bernardino Ochino to Pope Paul III* appeared in Rome, accusing the pontiff of innumerable crimes and presenting him as a new Nero and Antichrist, complete with a dedication to one of his fiercest enemies, Ascanio Colonna, Giovanni Bianchetti wrote to Della Casa, then nuncio in Venice, that the "invective against His Holiness" had been brought to Rome by the courier from Milan. It was therefore reasonable to suppose "that it originated there, and the blame is placed on the bishop of Pavia [Giovangirolamo de' Rossi] and Don Ferrante." This was probably not far from the truth. [156] In Modena, meanwhile, Lancillotti recorded the report that reached the city on 31 October: "His Holiness the pope has had the head cut off of ... [sic], brother-in-law of the most reverend Cardinal Morone, bishop of Modena, for attempting to negotiate the placement of Bologna in the emperor's hands." [157] Some time later, after hearing further rumours, he noted that Gallarati had "ratified" the accusations and that the pope had taken the opportunity to deprive Morone of "a large income," forcing him to dismiss numerous servants because he was "unable to bear the expense." [158]

At that point, all those involved in the obscure affair turned their eyes toward Charles V's response. The dossier from Gallarati's trial was sent to him. [159] From the court in Brussels, after examining the records and consulting his men in Italy, the emperor sent the pope a message intended to extinguish the scandal at its inception, explicitly referring to the possible injustices arising from the use of torture to elicit confessions or induce prisoners to say what the prosecution wished to hear. Gallarati, moreover, was "a noble gentleman with many relatives in Milan, a vassal and feudatory of His Majesty," and it was therefore wise not to act "with great haste, especially in regard to death," as nuncio Pietro Bertano wrote on 24 October 1548. In his own view, "if this gentleman were killed, the affair would be over and variously interpreted, but while he remains alive he will be more useful and more suitable for the purpose." [160]

Meanwhile the machinery of intercession, recommendation, and supplication had begun to move. The imperial ambassador in Rome, Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, exerted himself on behalf of Morone and his brother-in-law, after the cardinal sought his help before appealing directly to Brussels. [161] Morone's family also mobilised in Milan. Doubtless under pressure from his sister Anna, Massimiliano Stampa sent an agent to Rome to plead for the pope's mercy. Thanks to his impeccable pro-Habsburg record and the services

he had rendered Charles V after the death of Francesco II Sforza, including the peaceful surrender of Milan into imperial hands, Stampa was in a position to ask Ferrante Gonzaga directly about Gallarati's involvement. He received only the vague and unreliable reply "that he knew nothing of it and did not believe it." [162] The correspondence between the governor of Milan and the emperor reveals the contrary. "Catalano came to me and likewise proposed another scheme [in addition to that of the Bentivoglio], and [...] I gave him precisely the answer he has confessed," Gonzaga wrote to Charles V on 14 November 1548. He intended in turn to ask help for Gallarati because he did not wish "ever to reject entirely anyone who thinks of serving Your Majesty. But to tell Your Majesty the truth, the affair seemed to me to have such weak foundations that I did not wish to report it." In any case, together with Mendoza in Rome, he would try to help Gallarati as the emperor had ordered. "These gentlemen of the Morone family remain greatly indebted to Your Majesty for this," he wrote, urging Charles not to abandon his most devoted servants. [163]

It is therefore plausible, as had already occurred in the contacts between Don Ferrante and the Bentivoglio, [164] that Gonzaga's ambitious political initiative exceeded the emperor's intentions and expectations. He moved with considerable autonomy in the unstable situation created by Pier Luigi Farnese's assassination, also in order to pursue personal ambitions and strategies that the governor of Milan intended to submit to Charles V's approval only at a later stage, turning his attention now to Genoa, now to the Valtellina, Piacenza, Siena, or Savigliano. Indeed, Gonzaga himself confessed to the emperor that his strenuous efforts for "the preservation and enlargement" of the duchy of Milan expressed his "perhaps not altogether groundless opinion that, in order to preserve the states one possesses, it is sometimes necessary to acquire others, so that one may serve as a rampart for the other," as he wrote in a memorial of 1550. [165]

Although the imperial response slowed the inquiry for several months, it did not induce Paul III to suspend it. In January 1549 one of Morone's close collaborators, the Milanese priest Antonio Maria Carabelli, already mentioned above, was arrested. [166] Under torture he confessed his involvement in the conspiracy. On 3 March Girolamo Papino reported the news to the Este duke, adding that rumours in Bologna claimed Morone had fled Rome, that his household was terrified, "fearing that they will all be detained," and that "certain examinations against him" had also been conducted in the city and sent to Rome. "I think this will end badly," he concluded. [167] Ten days later he wrote that "every day new things are being discovered concerning the scheme to give Bologna to the emperor, and more will become known in future." This seemed confirmed by the fact that Legate Del Monte had changed the locks of the fortress, replaced the guards, ordered new arrests, and sent further interrogation records to Rome. [168] On 12 March a distinguished citizen, Ercole Malvezzi, informed Farnese that one of his sons had fled to the Kingdom of Naples, since he was said to have been "named by Signor Catalano Gallarati in his trial." [169] On 15 June Capilupi told the cardinal of Mantua that Carabelli had been sentenced to the galleys, while Gallarati was to undergo "perpetual imprisonment," although the pope intended merely to banish him and reduce Carabelli's penalty to five years at the oar. [170]

Gallarati's imprisonment in Rome mirrored that of Apollonio Filareto, formerly secretary to Pier Luigi Farnese, who after his master's death in September 1547 had been arrested and handed over to Ferrante Gonzaga. Gonzaga held him until 1551 in the castle of Milan, where he too was tortured. [171] During those same months Benedetto Accolti was also detained in Rome. [172] He was the young cousin of the cardinal of Ravenna of the same name, who together with Ercole Gonzaga represented the sharpest edge of the pro-imperial faction. Driven by family resentments, in early 1548 the young "madman" - who in 1564 would lead a conspiracy against Pius IV - had gone to Paul III and Cardinal Carafa to denounce his rich and powerful cardinal cousin to the Inquisition.

Moreover, as noted above, several members of the Bolognese elite, some associated with municipal and anti-Farnese opposition, were imprisoned in 1548: Cornelio and Guido Bentivoglio, Giulio Cesari of Novellara, Filippo Pepoli, and above all Vincenzo Bovio, canon of San Petronio and former secretary to Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo, who was linked to Cosimo de' Medici and his pro-Habsburg policy. [173] A few years earlier Bovio had made many enemies by sending Paul III a plan for reforming the Senate that aimed to correct the tendency of senatorial office to become hereditary - a tendency the pope had instead encouraged

in order to bind the local nobility to himself. [174] Accused of heresy, Bovio was imprisoned by the Holy Office together with two brothers, his cousin Annibale - who committed suicide in prison in January 1549 - and other Bolognese patricians. [175] Although unconnected with Gallarati's arrest, these disparate episodes reveal the intensification, also in anticipation of an imminent papal election, of political tensions accumulated over the preceding years, for which Morone risked becoming the scapegoat. As the perceptive Florentine ambassador in Rome, Averardo Serristori, wrote, beneath the surface chronicle of events lay Cardinal Del Monte's ambitions for the papacy: "by presenting himself as so great a churchman, so compliant with His Holiness's wishes, so partial to the house of Farnese, and so thoroughly French - the party that currently prevails in the voting - he believes he will greatly advance his designs." [176]

Serristori followed events closely, also because Gallarati's conspiracy unfolded against the background of the violent conflict between Paul III's Rome and Cosimo de' Medici's Florence, a clash nourished by old grievances and rivalries but brought to a head above all in 1545 by the expulsion of the friars of San Marco, a Savonarolan stronghold of republican opposition. Morone had intervened on that occasion too, trying to persuade the Medici duke to moderate his furious anger against Paul III, who ultimately forced him to reverse the decision. The duke replied at the end of April to the letter the Milanese cardinal had sent him on 13 April 1546, when the conflict was beginning to subside, though without abandoning a sharp irony in thanking him "for the prudent reminders you have given me." "For my part," he assured him, "I shall never fail to honour His Holiness as is fitting. I know well that throughout his pontificate he has remained at peace; whether the rest of Italy has done the same, I shall leave those touched by war to answer." It was almost a reproach to a cardinal of firm imperial loyalty who had good reason to share the judgement implicit in those words. "It is enough for me that in matters of importance to me and those concerning religion, His Holiness should remain satisfied, and should recognise that when, through the malignity of the times, his dignity is less esteemed by others, it is all the more honoured by me and held in the regard it truly deserves," Cosimo concluded with another barb. [177]

Morone himself directly linked Gallarati's arrest to events in Florence. According to the Medici agent Cherubino Bonanni, on 18 September 1548 he remarked "with a laugh" that Duke Cosimo too was implicated in the Farnese decision to arrest his brother-in-law. Within the imperial party, in other words, no one could feel safe. Yet, unable to verify his suspicions, the cardinal declined to answer his interlocutor's pressing questions: "Bonanni, I cannot tell you anything for the moment, but be content with this: as soon as I can or know anything more, you will be the first to be informed - unless I am forced to flee." [178] In Morone's view, therefore, the discovery of that amateurish conspiracy concealed a deliberate fabrication, an unscrupulous political design intended above all to strike its alleged promoters. A few days later Cosimo learned that, even before being questioned, Gallarati was said to have been accused of plotting "to place Bologna at His Majesty's devotion, with the support of Your Excellency and some aid from Signor Don Ferrante." Serristori believed that "the ill will of the most reverend Del Monte toward the said Morone has so aggravated the case that it has brought His Holiness to a decision from which the justification and liberation of the said Signor Catalano should result," as he wrote to Florence on 21 September, emphasising Morone's "perpetual indignation" against the brother-in-law who had dragged him into that vortex of slanders, childish impulses, and futile ambitions. [179] Yet shortly afterward, in a wholly different political and curial context, Del Monte, once elected Pope Julius III, would vigorously defend Morone against the attacks of the Holy Office. [180]

The manoeuvres surrounding Paul III's succession were therefore already under way. As a skilled diplomat, the Florentine ambassador soon realised that the Inquisition's arrest of the young Accolti in Bologna enabled it to put "a great deal of meat on the fire" against the cardinal of Ravenna, the duke of Florence, and the entire pro-imperial faction in the Sacred College. [181] Encouraged above all by the discredited Fioravanti - "universally regarded as a great villain, and said to have committed some sort of forgery in past years" [182] - suspicions against the duke of Florence nevertheless soon evaporated. Rome was left convinced that Ferrante Gonzaga alone had promoted the conspiracy. On 28 September the Medici ambassador informed the Florentine agent Giovanfrancesco Lottini that Morone was "greatly unsettled and

troubled, and would like this matter to reach a conclusion, so that punishment may follow if his said brother-in-law has erred, or liberation if he is found innocent; for while it remains suspended, it seems to him that many may doubt whether His Most Reverend Lordship had a hand in it." [183] On 6 October he wrote that "they do not appear to place much weight on our duke," since the Farnese aimed chiefly to "lay a heavy hand upon Signor Don Ferrante," whose responsibility for the "Piacenza affair" was by then evident. [184]

After his torture, Gallarati was returned to "good quarters" in Castel Sant'Angelo, while his accuser Fioravanti moved freely "throughout the Castle, from which he will leave tomorrow, as I understand, and will seek a reward for what he has revealed," Serristori predicted on 9 October. [185] Ten days later he specified that the expected reward was "a knighthood of Saint Peter worth seven or eight hundred scudi." [186] The turning point came at the end of February 1549, when Morone's brother-in-law confessed that he had "shared his intention concerning the affairs of Bologna" with the former legate's secretary. Carabelli was therefore summoned again, while the cardinal fell into "great affliction" because of the discredit attaching to him. It was, after all, "more than plausible that, in a matter of such importance, if his brother-in-law was involved and his secretary knew of it, His Most Reverend Lordship should reasonably have known as well," although, the Florentine ambassador concluded on 20 February, "the goodness and purity of his conscience may count for as much as they should." [187] Twice subjected to the torture of the rope, Carabelli eventually confessed that he had known of Gallarati's plans and had served as his "adviser so that he might see how to carry them out." Other alleged Bolognese accomplices were imprisoned, and some were tortured. [188]

Meanwhile the Farnese continued to reassure Morone through messages that were immediately relayed to Florence, where his involvement was considered entirely implausible. As Serristori wrote to Lottini on 10 April, not only would Morone never have entrusted himself to an incompetent such as his brother-in-law, but he would have had entirely different opportunities and means at his disposal for surrendering Bologna to the imperialists. [189]

> Morone's secretary has testified that His Most Reverend Lordship participated in Signor Catalano's plot, which, as I have learned from an excellent source, has weighed very heavily against him. Such a thing ought not even to be imagined of His Most Reverend Lordship, who gives such clear evidence of his goodness and virtue. Moreover, if what he presents of himself were artifice, it may be believed that, while he was legate of Bologna with the fortress in his hands and the guard under his command, His Most Reverend Lordship would have known how to employ other means than those that have appeared in order to bring the affair of Bologna to pass. Nor, if he had known of the plot, would he have been so imprudent as to come to Rome when he was outside it and in a place of some safety. His Most Reverend Lordship has been informed of the said testimony, and Signor Don Diego [Hurtado de Mendoza] has made him many offers in case he should decide to leave here. But his innocence is not frightened by the secretary's testimony; nor, he says, will it make him move one foot from this place, whatever further testimony might be given or whatever guarantees he might receive that he could depart safely. I do not know whether torture or something else drove the secretary to make that deposition.

Suspicions immediately arose that Carabelli's testimony too had been extorted under torture, as Serristori wrote to Florence on 11 April: "Last evening a note came out of the Castle from Morone's secretary, showing that under the force of torture he had testified that His Most Reverend Lordship knew of the plot in which Signor Catalano had taken part." As soon as he learned of it, Morone understood that the time had come to throw himself "at the feet of His Holiness and, emboldened by his innocence, spoke at length about what he had heard was imputed to him, offering to justify his innocence in whatever way might be required. His Holiness replied with great affection, showing that he had never believed, and did not believe, such a thing." [190] It is difficult to determine how sincere the pope was, what doubts or reservations he may have concealed, and therefore whether this magnanimous display of confidence formed part of a political strategy aimed at reducing tension with Charles V - an objective to which no one was better equipped than Morone to make a decisive contribution. Yet it is likely that Pope Farnese had too high an opinion of the Milanese cardinal's political intelligence to believe that the vain talk "at the inn" [191] between an impoverished Milanese nobleman and a notorious scoundrel amounted to any serious design.

It was one thing to exploit the conspiracy in order to attack Don Ferrante Gonzaga; it was another to destroy an eminent cardinal with improbable confessions extracted under torture, from which the pope stood to gain nothing. The silence of the sources, moreover, suggests that very few believed Morone was an accomplice, and fewer still that he had directed the machinations. Even Carafa, in later conclaves, would not dare invoke the affair, whose rigorous investigations in Bologna and Rome appeared to establish Gallarati's sole responsibility. The imperial threat itself was steadily diminishing. It was increasingly unlikely that Charles V would descend into Italy and march on Rome, and less likely still that he would present himself - as he had done in the past - as an emperor determined to seize the reins of Christendom in order to set the world in order and reform the Church, as Juan de Valdés had hoped in 1535. [192] The emperor was no longer returning from the crusading triumph of Tunis, and before long he would be forced to withdraw from Germany, unable to defend the cities conquered by the French. The time had come, in short, for everyone to return to guarding "his own chickens," as Giovangirolamo de' Rossi wrote to the cardinal of Ravenna in February 1549. [193]

In fact, only a few days after the meeting between Morone and Paul III were needed to establish the falsity of the charges against the Milanese cardinal. The Habsburg party was able to deploy all its strength, [194] to the point that on 30 April Morone asked Serristori to convey his gratitude to the duke of Florence. [195] When Cosimo sent him, through his father-in-law Don Pedro de Toledo, viceroy of Naples, a letter of congratulation dated 27 May 1549, Morone replied personally, thanking him for "the distress you felt over these troubles of mine" and referring him to whatever Don Pedro himself might report, certain that "in the end Your Excellency and the other good men will not be deceived in their judgement of my innocence." [196] The order issued in Rome in July "to remove from the Castle all the prisoners who were there and take them to Tor di Nona" amounted to no more than a final flick of the tail. Gallarati, Carabelli, and Accolti were transferred to the harsher prison, "but after their cases were considered more carefully they were returned to the Castle," the Tuscan ambassador reassured Florence on 16 July. [197]

In the weeks that followed, pressure from Charles V and dissension among his grandsons induced Paul III, now aware that death was near, to restore the duchy in the Po Valley to the Holy See, while Piacenza remained occupied by imperial forces. But the two grandsons, Alessandro and Ottavio, rejected the pontiff's decision. Paul suffered a seizure when he learned that at the end of October Ottavio had secretly left Rome for Parma. As for Alessandro, it was he who wrung from his dying grandfather the order to deliver the city to Ottavio. [198] Gallarati, Accolti, the Bovio family, and the other Bolognese conspirators escaped from prison amid the customary disorders of the vacant see, on the very day the pope died. [199]

Chapter Ten

"Poor and of Such Reputation in This College": In the Curia of Julius III

1. "Threats, Words, Insults": The Conclave of 1549-50

Paul III died in Rome on 10 November 1549. He was eighty-one and left behind many grave unresolved problems: the Protestant Reformation effectively unopposed in Germany and already moving toward consolidation of the status quo; the council suspended after the breach with the emperor over its transfer to Bologna; the long-awaited reform of the Church still far from achieving any result; and the very survival of the Farnese duchy of Parma and Piacenza in doubt, with the risk that it might serve as tinder for renewed wars in Italy between Habsburg and Valois. All this inevitably affected the conclave. The head-on conflict between the imperial and French parties and the rivalry between the "young" and "old" cardinals placed the keys to the papal election in the hands of Alessandro Farnese, the large faction that recognised his leadership, and his skill in manoeuvring between the interests of Church and family, which did not always coincide. But there was another force as well, unforeseen and unpredictable, that made its traumatic entry into a conclave for the first time and shaped its outcome: the Roman Holy Office. In only a few years it had acquired enormous power, founded on the preservation of orthodoxy as the primary duty of the ecclesiastical institution and the sole guarantee of its endurance through the centuries. Precisely because of its nature, that power could accept neither limits nor obstacles from anyone seeking to restrain its action or subordinate it to political logic, even if that person were Christ's vicar on earth, as would occur during the pontificate of Julius III. [1]

Paul III was the first to understand this, and for that very reason he "restrained the rigour of the inquisitors," [2] as in Pietro Carnesecchi's extrajudicial absolution in 1546. [3] That episode also shows that the *spirituali* were the principal target of the Holy Office. As early as September 1542, only a few weeks after the tribunal's establishment, Rome was conducting a "most minute investigation" into "Flaminio and the others who are staying in Viterbo with the cardinal of England." [4] From that time - and perhaps even earlier - Carafa and the zealous guardians of the true faith gathered around him had fought their opponents through charges of heresy, turning accusation into a lethal weapon in the struggle for power. At the end of April 1545, for example, in instructions for Francisco de Toledo, who was travelling to the imperial court, the Spanish ambassador in Rome, Juan de Vega, emphasised the cardinal of England's pro-Habsburg orientation and his well-known moral and religious severity, but at the same time reported that certain serious and learned persons believed that he adhered to erroneous doctrines. [5] It is not difficult to guess who those "serious and learned persons" were. For them, presenting themselves as the bulwark of Catholic orthodoxy was also a weapon with which to clear their path to the papacy.

This was stated with complete clarity in 1554, in anticipation of another conclave, by the Spanish ambassador Juan Manrique de Lara in a letter to Cardinal Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle. He deplored the fact that certain men pursued their ambitions for the tiara by slandering the best cardinals in order to make them appear unworthy of it. It was an old habit, he added: in the past, not knowing what to reproach exemplary figures such as Fregoso and Cortese with, they had accused them of heresy, just as they were now doing with several imperial cardinals, the ablest men in the Sacred College and, in his judgement, worthy not of one pontificate but twenty. [6]

Those words recalled the experience of the preceding conclave, which had marked a decisive moment in the triumph of the inquisitorial strategy of subordinating reform of the Church to the struggle against every form of heterodoxy. Carafa pursued that strategy in the conviction that heresy had to be defeated first of all in the Roman Curia, where it had assumed the elusive forms of Valdesian spirituality. The subterranean conflict, which had begun even before the bull *Licet ab initio*, grew steadily harsher over the following decade as suspicion and insinuation became deadly weapons in the struggle at the summit of the Church over the aims, methods, and instruments with which to confront its grave crisis. In a kind of spiritual testament

entrusted to his grandsons, the so-called *Counsels for Alessandro Farnese*, the newly deceased pope had expressed the hope that Reginald Pole would succeed him, describing him as "superior to the others in nobility, goodness, and learning." [7] Pole enjoyed imperial support and an unrivalled personal prestige in which his reputation for holiness, the royal blood in his veins, and the persecutions he had endured for his loyalty to the Church merged into one. It is likely that Paul III's preference reflected both the belief that the cardinal of England would not challenge Farnese possession of Parma and Piacenza, then under imperial pressure, and an awareness of the urgent need to begin a reform of the Church that had always been promised but never seriously undertaken.

As early as July 1548, even a sworn enemy of the pope such as Ercole Gonzaga had supported Pole's candidacy, presenting him to his brother Don Ferrante as "a saint, a man of excellent judgement in worldly affairs, and of the greatest learning," eager to restore England to the Catholic faith and make Charles V its "lord," to whom he was devoted "as much as any servant His Majesty has." [8] There were, of course, those who stressed his lack of political experience, feared a foreign pope, worried that he would be subordinate to English and imperial interests, and above all dreaded his rigorous programme of reform. If Pole became pope, Girolamo Muzio wrote to Ferrante Gonzaga on 26 November, "he would not tolerate anyone holding more than one beneficed church, and would want every bishop and every parish priest to go to his church; [...] he would abolish annates, reversions, and resignations, and [...] in short would depopulate Rome and ruin the offices." [9] A week later, as his odds continued to rise among the gamblers, Andreas Masius, the Roman agent of the Imperial Estates, reported that Pole seemed the favourite and added that he could see no reason why he should not be elected except his reputation as an upright and learned man. [10] Two days after the death of that "diabolical old man" Paul III, the cardinal of Mantua himself wrote to his brother expressing scepticism about Pole's candidacy, "because he is too good and the rest of us too carnal," and likewise about that of Morone, "our friend," but "too young and too much the servant" of Charles V. [11]

This is not the place to reconstruct in detail the tormented course of a conclave that became the theatre of a political conflict capable of redefining the balance of power in the Roman Curia. [12] Pole's election encountered an insurmountable obstacle in Carafa, who was able to use the tribunal of the Holy Office over which he presided to prevent the papal tiara from being placed on the head of a man he judged a heretic. It was a decisive moment in his struggle against the *spirituali*. The *Extra omnes* was pronounced on 29 November, and from the first days rumours and insinuations circulated through the Vatican corridors, showing that something was being prepared. On 26 November, for example, the exceptionally well-informed Girolamo Muzio reported that "many believe that in certain articles of Lutheranism he [Pole] is not entirely free of heresy." A week later he expressed grave doubts about Pole's chances of election, above all because the Holy Office considered him "a man of unsound doctrine, and it is said that there are cardinals inside who have brought condemnable writings of his in order to show them and oppose him with them." [13] On that same 2 December Giovan Battista Cervini, the cardinal's nephew, knew that "the proceedings against him are in the conclave," while according to the Florentine ambassador Averardo Serristori, from the opening stages Pole had been accused "of not holding sound views in matters of faith." [14] In the summer of 1552 the cardinal of Carpi would recall that "many things had been heard against Cardinal Pole, and writings and papers were in hand." [15] Whether true or false, it was rumoured that the inquisitors had brought similar files concerning cardinals of the stature of Niccolò Ridolfi and Giovanni Salviati. [16] This demonstrated the ruthlessness with which Carafa sharpened his weapons even against men free from suspicion of heterodoxy, but who were his rivals both politically, for leadership of the anti-Habsburg faction, and religiously, in the contest for the papacy.

The climactic scene, in which the Theatine cardinal openly denounced Pole as suspected of heresy, [17] took place on the morning of 5 December, before the French cardinals had arrived, after the first ballots had placed the English cardinal far ahead of every other candidate despite the ambitions and rivalries tearing the imperial party apart. That morning his supporters gathered in the Pauline Chapel, where the colours of Michelangelo's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* were still damp. [18] They were determined to elect him by acclamation, even though the day before Pole had rejected the proposal, saying that he did not wish to enter

through the window but through the door, [19] and that if it were God's will for him to become pope, that will would remain unchanged the following day. Those noble words gave the pasquinade writers material to ridicule him as "such a fool that he waits for the dove | to proclaim him husband of the Church | and even unfasten his breeches." [20] Only Marcello Cervini's mediation with the cardinals who had remained in the Sistine Chapel made it possible to resume the voting, whose outcome nevertheless appeared certain.

It was then that Carafa finally decided to throw the full weight of his authority into the balance and "said openly that Pole was suspected of heresy," [21] turning into formal charges the gossip that had circulated above all since Pole's withdrawal from Trent on the eve of the approval of the decree on justification. As Angelo Massarelli recorded, at the end of the ballot he lacked only one vote for the required majority, and therefore a single cardinal needed only to alter his ballot through the procedure known as *accessus*. Absolute silence fell, Massarelli reported. The cardinals looked at one another, and some nodded to colleagues, inviting them to accede, but no one spoke and the ballot was closed. [22] Those votes were the maximum the imperialists and Farnese party could obtain, the imperial ambassador Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza commented, convinced that Pole's candidacy had reached its end. [23] And so it had, even though that morning many cardinals had already ordered their conclave cells dismantled and their palaces secured against the customary looting, while it was said that Pole had prepared his speech accepting the tiara and that someone had brought him the papal robes. [24]

Cervini's role was especially ambiguous. He was extremely active in "ruining Pole's cause" while always professing to be his convinced supporter. [25] This is also evident in the scarcely concealed satisfaction with which his secretary Massarelli recorded the English cardinal's exclusion on suspicion that he had fallen into some heresy, especially concerning justification. The imperialists, by contrast, claimed that the defeat resulted from the ambitions of "those who aspired to the papacy" and the fears of men who, "because they improperly enjoyed some office or knew themselves stained by some foul deed punishable by a good pope, feared Pole's holiness." [26] Mendoza immediately informed Charles V, emphasising the indignation of many cardinals on hearing Carafa's accusations. On 13 December he reported that Carafa and the dean of the Sacred College, De Cupis, had attacked Pole with unprecedented violence, saying that he was a heretic, that he would destroy the Church, squander its temporal possessions, humiliate the cardinals by depriving them of their revenues, do at the council everything the emperor wanted, and uttering "a thousand other similar lies and insults." [27]

That "turbulent conclave" [28] dragged on amid the foul vapours of sanitary conditions that soon became intolerable, further poisoning an atmosphere that grew steadily more tense and bitter, amid "threats, [...] words, [...] insults." [29] The imperialists became increasingly divided and incapable of finding a new candidate, while the French remained united behind Carafa, although they knew that the ascetic severity in which he wrapped himself was not the best path to election. Increasingly exasperated and powerless before the looming imperial defeat - caused in part by Charles V's own errors and his obstinate insistence on an impossible candidate, the Dominican inquisitor Juan Álvarez de Toledo, closely allied to Carafa - Mendoza wrote to Granvelle on 3 February that the cardinals in conclave were more diabolical and confused than the devils in Judas's hell, and there was therefore no cause for surprise that they elected popes resembling themselves. [30]

After a possible compromise on Giovanni Salviati failed, and after sixty ballots, the exhausted College of Cardinals finally agreed on Giovanni Maria Del Monte, even though Charles V had excluded him on the eve of the conclave because of his role presiding over the council, first at Trent and then at Bologna. The choice sprang from exhaustion, reciprocal vetoes, the collapse of the pro-Habsburg party to which the Holy Office had contributed, and the very mediocrity of the man to whom the tiara was entrusted. Paolo Giovio, a shrewd observer of men and affairs in the papal Curia, seemed to grasp this when he jokingly congratulated the cardinal of Carpi "that you have chosen a fine melon from a large basket that came from Ostia, one with a handsome rind, good weight, a proper blossom, and a green stem, so that one may hope it proves perfect when cut with the knife." [31] Juan Manrique de Lara would be even more savage. In a letter to Charles V of 5 November 1553 he called Julius a worthy and well-intentioned man, but no braver than a drenched hen. [32]

It is difficult to reconstruct Morone's role during those interminable weeks. Universally recognised as a man of great prestige, morality, and ability, but too young to be elected, [33] and moreover recently suspected of organising an anti-papal conspiracy, he preferred to maintain a low profile. Yet he consistently supported Pole, with whom Charles V listed him among the cardinals acceptable to the emperor. [34] According to the Bolognese nobleman Romeo Foscarari, as early as 1547-48 many of the "ambassadors and courtiers" of the Curia said that "in that Sacred College there were no cardinals more worthy than the cardinals of England and Morone." [35] Morone received ten votes on 18 November, five on 6 December, and eleven on the twelfth, although the older cardinals opposed him. [36] There can be no doubt, however, that his name began to emerge as that of a possible candidate.

Soon afterward, in a letter to Ottaviano Raverta, bishop of Terracina, Giovio placed the Milanese cardinal alongside Carafa, Pole, and Cervini among the "withdrawn" cardinals - the most serious and religiously committed members of the College - who "will not, or ought not, place their consciences at risk by giving their votes merely to please some unworthy person; [...] and it is certain that each of them considers himself not unworthy of the papacy." [37] On 10 January Giovan Francesco Arrivabene wrote to Sabino Calandra, castellan of Mantua, that Morone was "held in great esteem, although he is no longer spoken of." Yet in the ballot of 15 January, when the imperialists proposed him, he received no fewer than twenty-six votes out of forty-nine. [38] Some years later, in 1560, a nephew of Cardinal Verallo would recall that when Verallo declared his *accessus* to Morone, whom he called "one of the angels of paradise," Carafa assailed him with violent abuse, furious at a compliment that must have sounded to him like a profession of heresy. [39] In that conclave the Milanese cardinal was himself touched by the accusations that had struck Pole so brutally. He heard "some sort of murmuring" about himself in connection with the *Benefit of Christ* and his efforts to promote its circulation. [40] In 1557, immediately after Morone's arrest, Paul IV himself would declare that he had possessed "proceedings dating back to the time of Paul III [...] of great importance," and that he knew Paul III had already corrected Morone paternally, but that "he and another had never corrected themselves; indeed, to the danger of this most holy see, both had nearly attained this most holy dignity." [41]

The true victors in the contest played out in the conclave were therefore two men who were themselves adversaries: Cosimo de' Medici, who immediately began working to induce the new pontiff to draw closer to the emperor, [42] and Alessandro Farnese. Both succeeded in excluding from the papal throne representatives of the Italian princely families - a shared interest - while Cosimo could count on the goodwill of a Tuscan pope and at the same time prevent the election of an anti-Medici exile such as Salviati or Ridolfi, and Farnese could rely on the gratitude of a prelate who owed everything to Paul III and who did not appear driven by excessive reforming zeal or anxious to restore Parma to the Church, so much so that some observers were astonished to see how that resolutely pro-French cardinal had become a pro-imperial pope. But the Holy Office was also among the victors. At the last moment it had succeeded in preventing the tiara from being placed on the head of a presumed heretic and, at the same time, in measuring the effectiveness of its power of veto, without concerning itself greatly with Pope Del Monte's far from exemplary conduct or his lack of interest in reforming the Church. Hubert Jedin called it "oppressive" to think that a cardinal of Pole's intellectual and moral stature had been accused of heresy, [43] aware that the religious and political conflict then breaking out at the summit of the Church threatened to empty the very concept of Catholic reform of meaning and expose its glaring aporias and contradictions. The same applies to Thomas Mayer's confused reconstruction, which seeks to diminish the role of the Holy Office by returning the clash between Carafa and Pole to an exclusively political plane, as a mere reflection of the conflict between pro-French and pro-imperial forces, with Alessandro Farnese holding the balance, and with the consequence that the reforming party to which both men belonged split for political reasons. [44]

2. "Bundles of Papers" and "Condemnable Writings of His"

It is impossible, however, to judge the conflict between the two cardinals solely in the light of episodic circumstances and a few misunderstandings within a supposedly common reforming camp. The investigations into Pole and his associates that the Holy Office began in the very days of its establishment

have already been mentioned. [45] They undoubtedly arose from the Theatine's doctrinal severity and ambitions for the tiara, but they were nourished by suspicious hostility and personal antipathy from the moment the two men were created cardinals together in 1536, when "a certain rivalry and mistrust between those two lords" immediately began, as Carnesecchi would recall in 1560. [46] As late as 1568 Endimio Calandra stated that he had learned that Paul IV's "persecution" of the *spirituali* "proceeded entirely from hatred": a hatred not appeased by having "done Pole that injury of not allowing him to become pope," for now Carafa "wished to finish ruining him," and Morone as well, whom he detested as Pole's friend, [47] but perhaps also as the son of Girolamo Morone, who at the end of the 1520s had certainly won no affection from either the Neapolitan nobility or the Roman Curia.

Reducing everything to political intrigue and chance events does not, however, explain the facts, nor does it clarify why seventeen years later, recalling that tormented conclave, Carnesecchi would say that Pole would have been "most fortunate" had he died when he "emerged so gloriously from Julius's conclave," adding with characteristically Valdesian ambiguity that "God knows better than anyone what was most fitting for the salvation of his soul." [48] So glorious, one gathers, because of the rectitude of his conduct, because he had refused to enter the electoral fray and remained "neutral," [49] because he had overcome every earthly ambition, and because he had known how to respond to his enemies' slanders with composed firmness. During those weeks Pole spent much of his time writing a treatise *De summo pontifice*, which he dedicated on 20 January 1550, from his cell in the conclave, to the sixteen-year-old cardinal of Urbino, Giulio Della Rovere. [50] In it he drew an austere portrait of the duties incumbent upon the successors of Peter.

Beyond the hagiographical myth and his personal irresolution, it is likely that the English cardinal was the first not to desire the burdensome insignia of the papacy. They would have forced him to emerge from his Valdesian cocoon - as he had been obliged to do during the conciliar legation and as would later happen, with equally disappointing results, when he became the last Catholic archbishop of Canterbury - and become an actor in a history that he firmly believed to be always and entirely in God's hands. "As for the papacy," Marcantonio Flaminio wrote to Ulisse Bassiano on 14 December 1549, "I assure you that he will leave the conclave more willingly as a cardinal than as pope, although no one could believe it without knowing His Lordship as intimately as I do." [51] Yet a man of his rank cannot have swallowed that humiliation easily. This is shown by the words he wrote in the so-called *Apologia* addressed to his chief adversary after Carafa had become Pope Paul IV, deprived him of the English legation in April 1557, and summoned him back to Rome to imprison him together with Morone.

In those pages, vibrating with indignation, Pole recalled Carafa's insinuations and a conversation in his conclave cell during the election of Julius III, in which he told him how deeply he had been wounded. This was undoubtedly the meeting recorded in the diary of one of his household, Bartolomeo Stella, under the date 30 January 1550. [52] The Theatine replied with a long discourse about the false accusations and slanders that generally assailed cardinals in conclave, warning Pole to avoid their authors as he would serpents. It was a shameless lie, but one that had led Pole to hope that Julius III's accession would finally bring that whole comedy - or rather tragedy - to an end. [53] Whatever Carafa's hypocrisy, the fact remains that for the first time such accusations had been used as a deadly political weapon to determine the outcome of a papal election, creating a precedent that would not fail to be repeated.

Yet the many accounts of Pope Del Monte's conclave have neglected an essential question: what exactly were Pole's "condemnable writings," or even the actual "proceedings" that Carafa allegedly brought with him and displayed in the Sistine Chapel to substantiate his sensational accusations? What specific charges were involved, beyond the generic claim that Pole professed heretical doctrines? Only faint traces survive. One appears, for example, in Beccadelli's *Life* of the English cardinal, where it is said that his opponents even accused him of having "a daughter supported in a convent in Rome." [54] Another appears in an account of the papal election according to which, on 5 December, the Theatine cardinal accused Pole of regarding as acceptable the opinion of a Carmelite that alms given while in mortal sin had no value. Pole dismissed these as mere slanders and replied to his fellow cardinal and inquisitor Juan Álvarez de Toledo that there was no need to answer them publicly until it was first clear who was responsible for them. [55] Without doubt, the

conversation between Pole and Carafa also touched upon his withdrawal from Trent to avoid signing the decree on justification and upon his friendship with Flaminio, the acknowledged heir to Valdés's teaching, whom he housed in his own residence and who would die there ten days after Julius III's election.

On 14 December 1550 Mendoza reported to the imperial court that among the calumnies directed at the cardinal of England was the fear that, if elected pope, he would convene a council in Germany. [56] Apart from suspicions concerning Flaminio, however, no trace of any such material appears in the extensive inquisitorial documentation now available concerning the *spirituali*. The fire in the Ripetta prison in August 1559 certainly caused serious losses among the papers accumulated by the Holy Office over the preceding decades. Yet what survives in its archives contains no trace of Pole's "condemnable" writings - his manuscripts would enter the Vatican archives only at a later date [57] - and still less of any formal "proceedings" against him. Only in 1559, and again in connection with Morone's trial, do we find the inquisitors compiling a *Libellus in quo [sunt] indicia contra reverendissimum Polum*. [58] This does not mean, of course, that Carafa had gathered no evidence against him, but it was not evidence constituting the acts of a trial.

Carafa's announcement to the Sacred College that he could substantiate his charges with "writings and bundles of papers" [59] was therefore a perilous gamble, if not an outright bluff, to which he was driven in order to prevent Pole's election and with it the collapse of the political and religious strategy he had pursued since the 1530s. The gamble was made possible by Carafa's prestige, his ostentatious ascetic severity, his reputation as a zealous reformer, and his doctrinal authority. Yet it succeeded by the narrowest margin: because of that single missing vote, Pole's latest withdrawal from the battlefield on which he had been challenged, and the many divisions weakening the imperial party. It was also the *extrema ratio* used to prevent an otherwise inevitable outcome, the last weapon available to that overbearing old man who combined the impetuosity of his certainties with great slowness in action, as Morone himself would soon tell him to his face, [60] and who entered that decisive conclave still unprepared, so that he had to resort precisely to a bluff.

This was not to happen again, as the feverish inquisitorial activity of the following months plainly reveals. That, indeed, was the chief political consequence of a conclave to which Pole and his closest associates instead gave the disconcerting historical and prophetic interpretation already described, [61] as they struggled to come to terms with the traumatic failure of a papal election that had seemed certain on the eve of the vote.

The broader problem underlying the entire episode summarised in these pages remains open: what renewal of the ecclesiastical institution did Pole actually hope for, and what concrete content did it possess? There was the delicate issue of the benefice system and its intolerable abuses, which nevertheless formed the vital financial lung of the papal Curia and the instrument of its political autonomy in the context of the great European powers. There was the still more delicate question of the Church's doctrinal identity, touching the very way Christian faith was conceived and lived. There was the question of its institutional structure and the hierarchy of powers then being redefined in an increasingly centralised and top-down form. There was the pastoral question of how to guide the faithful toward different forms of participation in ecclesial life, how to express their devotional needs, and how to think about their salvation. Finally, there was the question of how to confront the conflicts between Habsburg and Valois, the rupture of the Protestant churches, the Anglican schism, and the religious dissent proliferating throughout Italy. The generic moral exhortations of the *De reformatione Ecclesiae* carefully avoided the treacherous labyrinths of such questions and therefore offered no answers. Perhaps those answers remained vague, obscure, and wishful even in the mind and heart of the would-be *papa angelicus* who had missed election by a hair.

The fact remains, however, that in the 1540s Pole, though animated by the thoroughly Valdesian conviction that God alone directs the course of history, had promoted intense proselytism and acted on the political plane as well. In the summer of 1542 he had sent the Modenese Academicians texts by Fregoso and Valdés to present to their bishop as compendia of their faith. He had suggested to Morone the names of preachers to send into his diocese. He had encouraged and protected the revision and later the printing of the

Benefit of Christ, and probably of other heterodox works published at the time, such as the *Christian Alphabet*, the catechism, and the short treatises of Juan de Valdés. He had written the *De reformatione Ecclesiae* and a lost *De modo concionandi*. He had circulated prohibited books. He had guided friends and disciples along the path of a renewed faith, men and women "who proclaimed and revered him as an angel from heaven and listened to him as to an oracle," [62] including figures of the stature of Giovanni Morone and Vittoria Colonna. Twice, in 1542 and 1545, he had served as legate to the Council of Trent, believing he could influence its proceedings. He had enjoyed Charles V's confidence and the admiration of everyone, even his enemies. He had become a point of reference for many who looked with hope and trust to his irreproachable figure, his exalted rank as both prince of the blood and prince of the Church, his learning and transparent faith, perhaps also his taciturn ambiguity and solemn beard of an ancient prophet.

This helps explain why certain exiles *religionis causa* sought to exorcise his unrivalled charisma. On the eve of the conclave Vergerio had done precisely this, pointing to the Nicodemite ambiguities of a prelate reputed "to possess light, to recognise the errors of the Church, and to taste the sweetness of the Gospel," yet who refrained from openly declaring his faith in Christ at the very moment when Christ was "so greatly assailed, troubled, and afflicted." "May God grant him courage, and it would indeed be time for him to declare himself together with his entire school," he concluded. [63]

It was no accident that the inquisitors concentrated their early suspicions and first investigations on Pole. They knew well - as Giovan Battista Scotti, an implacable accuser of the *spirituali*, would tell them - that the "Lutherans of Italy" rejoiced that "such a man" shared their ideas "and would help them in times of persecution," declaring themselves certain that "if Pole had become pope, matters of faith would have been arranged according to their wishes." [64] According to Friar Bernardo Bartoli as well, once his disciple at Viterbo, many heterodox believers had hoped that a man of Pole's stature would ascend the throne of Peter, convinced that religious affairs would then take the course they desired. [65] For this reason, to prevent an election that would have endangered the Christian faith, the Theatine cardinal intervened in the conclave brandishing the "bundles of papers" the Holy Office had managed to gather against the cardinal of England.

Vergerio himself, shortly after taking refuge in Switzerland, had declared that "Italy is further advanced than some people think," expressing certainty that the doctrines from beyond the Alps would ultimately triumph there because "the number of the faithful [...] is growing greatly by the grace of God, and there are countless people who understand the matter very well," to the point that in Rome itself "there are many people who defend as true the opinions and rebukes of the Protestants." [66] It is possible that Carafa read these disturbing words and drew from them the resolve to act with the utmost urgency. If the Holy Office had been created to enable the Church to combat its enemies and safeguard the true faith, then, after a single vote had prevented a heretic from wearing the tiara, the moment had come to act decisively and crush once and for all those *spirituali* who represented the gravest threat to Catholic orthodoxy. Now that everyone knew, in short, it was time to act without further caution, scruple, or hesitation.

The very climate of the papal Curia was destined to change profoundly once the conflict degenerated to the point of making obsolete the refined art of speech, courtly civility, and prelatical composure that had hitherto been able to disguise its divisions. After what had happened in the conclave, after the explicit invocation of the spectre of heresy to strike at the heart of a distinguished member of the Sacred College, the breaking point was reached. Rivalry and conflict rooted in differing political and religious orientations gave way to charges of heresy, declarations of war, and outright insults. [67]

In 1552, when Julius III informed Morone that Carafa was defaming him "in matters of the Inquisition," and someone asked the reason for such hostility, the Milanese cardinal recalled "the words exchanged between him and me" in the conclave, when Morone had refused to vote for Carafa on the grounds that his conscience forbade it. When the Theatine had sent word that "he did not aspire to or seek the papacy," but was "only grieved to hear that Cardinal Morone, being a man of such quality, said that his conscience did not direct him to give him his vote," Morone had not hesitated to reply bluntly that he did not consider Carafa "suited to the papacy, because [...] he would be slow in all business and actions and would be irresolute." [68] In reality, despite professions of esteem, Carafa lost no opportunity to vent "ill feeling and ill will" against

him. The commissary general of the Holy Office, Friar Teofilo Scullica, likewise spoke against him without restraint, above all because of his "association with Pole," [69] circulating accusations that the irascible cardinal of Naples did not merely whisper but proclaimed publicly.

This had already happened during curial debates over the transfer of the council in 1546, when Carafa shouted that the Milanese cardinal betrayed the habit he wore by "placing himself in the service" of Charles V. Morone replied to those contemptuous and offensive words that he "acknowledged no lord other than His Holiness and the Apostolic See." [70] Now, however, Carafa allowed himself to insinuate that Morone's political connection with the house of Austria arose from unavowable religious complicities.

3. Julius III

Experienced in government and solidly trained in law, but lacking theological culture and religious sensitivity, Julius III (plate 1) was hardly the person best suited to promote even a mild initiative for the renewal of the Church. Seripando would comment on his death that, while his predecessor had always spoken of reform without ever doing anything, Julius had not even spoken of it. [71] As early as 2 January 1550, in a letter to Mendoza, Ercole Gonzaga had called him "mad, ill-mannered, and furious." [72] On 9 February, two days after his election, Muzio reported that "everyone speaks very badly of him, saying he is vicious, proud, dissolute, and headstrong, that his family is of the lowest sort, and that he has no relatives except peasants, gluttons, and swordsmen." [73]

A coarse man of irascible and choleric temperament, [74] paralysed in decision-making by an impulsive and changeable character, and often kept from his duties by excesses of food that confined him to bed with gout, the new pontiff seemed chiefly intent on devoting himself "with great pleasure to leisure," giving "free rein to his nature and pleasures." [75] Fond of splendour and quickly surrounded by a court of ravenous relatives, he emptied the papal coffers to finance the construction of his suburban residence, Villa Giulia, with frescoes depicting scantily clad deities, wine-drenched Bacchuses, and naked children climbing among flowering hedges. The pope amused himself (*delitiatur*) even more than Leo X, Vergerio wrote, [76] for once agreeing with Carafa in indignation at Julius's passion for hunting, court jesters, theatrical entertainments, and above all continual banquets and gambling, [77] without concern for the terrible famine afflicting a Rome impossibly crowded with pilgrims who had come for the jubilee.

The savage pasquinades directed at him accused him above all of being a "great sodomite," [78] in part because he raised Innocenzo Del Monte to the Sacred College. This was the "little scoundrel" whom, in Parma, where he had served as governor from 1537 to 1544, Julius had received "in his chamber and in his own bed as though he were his son or nephew." [79] He had the boy adopted by his brother Baldovino Del Monte and launched him on an ecclesiastical career whose dignity the young man was incapable even of appearing to preserve.

Julius III's reform initiatives were insubstantial, although he himself believed that hostility toward the clergy arose "solely from the avarice shown by its leaders in this court, from the poor provision they made in conferring benefices, and from the excessive luxury of the said clergy." [80] The proposals concerning the Sacred College, the conclave, episcopal residence, the regular clergy, priestly ordination, preaching, indulgences, the Dataria, the Penitentiary, and the Segnatura, advanced by the commission *De reformatione Ecclesiae* established in February 1551, remained largely a dead letter. Morone was a member of that commission. [81] He had also been appointed to the commission *De reformatione morum* in September 1550, to that on the Studium Urbis in October, to that on the council in November - always together with Pole - and later to the commission on customs duties in July 1552. [82] Work proceeded slowly, however, and the bull *Varietas temporum*, which was to embody the proposals and was expected in the spring of 1554, was never promulgated because of the pope's death. [83] Morone's judgement was therefore rather optimistic when, on 30 December 1554, he wrote to Pole, then engaged in restoring Catholicism in England, that "here attention is being given to reform, and Our Lord shows himself so ardent about it that we may hope soon to see some good effect," although he did not conceal that time would be needed and that at first matters "may perhaps not be brought to complete perfection." [84]

It is significant, moreover, that the last of the 150 canons the bull was to promulgate entrusted supervision of their enforcement to the cardinals of the Holy Office. [85] This was precisely what Giovan Francesco Commendone had predicted in his perceptive *Discourse on the Court of Rome*, written after Pope Del Monte's election. He stated that before long the supreme inquisitors would follow the example of the ancient Roman censors, who, "created for one particular office, grew so powerful that they could move and alter the entire republic." [86] The election of Paul IV would confirm this penetrating judgement. It is also echoed in what Seripando, himself soon to become the object of suspicion, wrote when he stressed how that tribunal, mild and moderate under Paul III, had so greatly expanded its functions and authority under the ruthless Carafa that its activity was regarded as the most terrible and frightening in the world. [87] Morone would be among the first to experience this personally.

Immediately after the new pope's election, the Holy Office went into action. Among other measures, to prevent a repetition of what had happened in the conclave, it co-opted into its leadership several representatives of the imperial party, such as Girolamo Verallo and Marcello Crescenzi. [88] They joined Juan Álvarez de Toledo and Francesco Sfondrati, who died on 31 July 1550. By giving them an institutional role, the tribunal subordinated their political loyalty to the primacy of orthodoxy and the scruples of conscience it entailed. The same occurred with the cardinal of Carpi, admonished by the inquisitors in 1549 for his reticence in favour of a Florentine friar [89] and then a convinced supporter of the cardinal of England, but later aligned with positions of uncompromising rigour after being appointed to the supreme tribunal of faith in July 1550. His conduct in the two conclaves of 1555 would be completely different, and he would play a leading role in the campaign against Pole and Morone. [90]

There can be no doubt that his conduct also arose from personal ambitions he had never abandoned, although these were obstructed by the fact that he was "considered so wicked a man, [...] so hated by the entire College that, so to speak, they would sooner consent to elect Satan as pope than him," as Ercole Gonzaga wrote. [91] Gonzaga called him a "petty schemer" and went so far as to swear to Cardinal Madruzzo "that I would sooner eat grass than ever help him to the papacy." [92]

Pope Del Monte's political direction was equally uncertain, as became immediately clear from the confused management of the war of Parma, which opened a chasm in the papal treasury, while the armies of Henry II of Valois reappeared in Italy and the ruler of Algiers, Khayr al-Din, known as Barbarossa, an ally of the king of France, sent Barbary galleys cruising off Naples and Ostia, spreading panic in Rome. [93] The chief success of Julius III's pontificate was entirely accidental: Mary Tudor's accession to the English throne, which opened the way to Catholic restoration through the appointment of Reginald Pole as papal legate and archbishop of Canterbury. Another positive result was the resumption of the council at Trent, which between May 1551 and April 1552 approved the decrees on the sacraments already discussed at Bologna. [94]

Although the history of the council, especially its transfer, had previously placed the newly elected pontiff in the anti-imperial camp, energetic pressure from Cosimo de' Medici and the renewal of the Habsburg-Valois conflict in the war of Parma led Julius to adopt a policy of neutrality. This could also draw upon his excellent relations with Morone, soon reinforced by the increasingly bitter conflict between the papacy and the Inquisition. [95] Among other things, this allowed the Milanese cardinal to continue benefiting from his prestige at Charles V's court. In April 1553 Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza reiterated this to Pietro Camaiani, then nuncio in Brussels, stating that the emperor held Morone and Bertano in great esteem, "regarding them as men of the highest distinction." [96]

In this connection, note should be taken of the memorial Morone sent Charles V on 2 November 1554, in which he advised him to return Piacenza to the Farnese in order to calm the suspicions of many Italian princes and lords, who "have always been alarmed by the power of His Imperial Majesty, fearing that by means of it he wishes to make himself master of all Italy." If the peninsula was to be pacified, Morone wrote with hard-headed realism, it was necessary "either to eradicate the house of Farnese entirely, for it cannot remain as it is and will never cease stirring up trouble in these regions, or in some manner to win it over." [97]

It was within this framework that the Milanese cardinal was assigned a substantial number of ecclesiastical benefices, which his predecessor had instead been reluctant to grant him despite Morone's

many services to the Holy See in Germany, Trent, Bologna, and Rome. Until then he had been a "poor" cardinal, whose "meagreness of income," reported by Cervini to the pope in the summer of 1548, [98] did not permit a standard of living comparable to that of the richest cardinals of the Curia. He could rely on family resources in the Milanese, although these had been greatly diminished, even if they were administered efficiently and rigorously by his energetic sister Anna Morone Stampa. [99]

On 5 January 1550, still shut inside the Vatican during the interminable conclave that elected Julius III, Ercole Gonzaga wrote to his brother, governor of Milan, conveying the greetings of two Milanese cardinals, Giovanni Morone and Gian Angelo de' Medici. He presented them as "friends" and "brothers" and asked that Charles V be reminded of the many "services" they had rendered, especially Morone, "who is poor and of such reputation in this College that, had he wished to do as much disservice as he has done service, he would have been of the greatest importance." "I do not think anyone is more in need than he, or more deserving," he concluded. [100]

In May 1556 Morone himself wrote to Filippo Gheri, then in Milan and bound for the court in Brussels, complaining of the rise in all prices because of the drought and informing him that he had not yet requested his "allowance, or at least the six hundred scudi in compensation that I had upon Camerino" - of which there is no other record. Yet, "seeing the many expenses of His Holiness," he did not dare press the claim. "I have gone on reducing my household," he concluded, "but even so, if I do not wish to incur new debts, it will be necessary to sell the rest of the silver." [101] As late as September 1562 Pope Pius IV would cite his far from lavish standard of living as an example, placing him among the "cardinals who had little income and from it maintained themselves with a respectable household without falling into debt." [102]

4. "I Maintain a Household, Not a Court": Living as a Cardinal

After living for more than ten years almost always away from Rome - as nuncio in Germany, legate at Trent, bishop of Modena, and legate of Bologna - Giovanni Morone settled permanently in the Curia with the accession of Julius III,

strengthened by the esteem of the new pontiff and by the prestige he had acquired in the service of the Holy See, which made him one of the most authoritative voices in the College of Cardinals. It was probably at this time that he bought, built, or renovated the modest little palace that still looks onto Vicolo Moroni in Trastevere, a street that would take its name from his descendants. Far from the most distinguished sites in the Roman topography of the cardinals and devoid of all ostentation, it bears only a small coat of arms still visible on an exterior wall. [103] At the end of 1543, on the eve of his appointment as legate of Bologna, his limited financial resources and the constant missions entrusted to him meant that he had no permanent residence in Rome. He therefore had to ask - and obtained permission - to use Cardinal Benedetto Accolti's palace in the Borgo, after Accolti's bitter conflict with Pope Farnese had forced him to take refuge in Florence. [104] In January 1546, when Morone had to move from Bologna to Rome to follow the affairs of the council, Cervini placed his own residence at Morone's disposal. [105] The previous year Morone had had five pack-loads “of his possessions, that is, gilt leather hangings, tapestries, and books” transported there. [106]

Living in the Eternal City, however, entailed enormous costs if one was to maintain, both publicly and privately, a standard worthy of cardinalatial rank in a city made especially expensive by the multitude of prelates' households clustered around the papal court. As Pierre Hurtubise has observed, one could not claim to be “great” without being condemned to live “greatly.” [107] Unable to meet the demands of a standard of living regarded as indispensable for anyone wearing the purple, the so-called poor cardinals - Morone among them - were often forced to stay away from Rome, lest they be confined “like prisoners at home,” having “no means whatever to live or to go out with servants, as that dignity requires.” So Ugolino Grifoni wrote to Ferdinando de' Medici in April 1569. A few months earlier he had warned him that “poor cardinals cannot remain in Rome, since every kind of provision is dear except bread,” and that one spent there “three times as much as in Florence.” As early as 1544, from his diocese of Carpentras, Iacopo Sadoleto had informed Alessandro Farnese that he could not reside in Rome “without extreme squalor and mockery of the cardinalate.” Between taxes of various kinds, expensive customs, and more or less compulsory gratuities, the ceremony of receiving the red biretta alone could cost just under a thousand scudi. [108]

The number of Morone's household members is unknown, [109] but maintaining the numerous cardinalatial courts - always and rigorously all-male [110] - normally required between 5,000 and 10,000 scudi a year, between one-half and two-thirds of it for food alone. The figure could rise, however, to more than 15,000 for Ippolito d'Este and 30,000 for Alessandro Farnese. [111] Acts of patronage to foster letters and promote the arts were likewise obligatory: rewarding dedications of books; supporting theologians, poets, historians, philosophers, philologists, and preaching friars; [112] collecting antiquities of every kind - statues, reliefs, vases, bronzes, coins, and cameos; [113] commissioning altarpieces, frescoes, sculptures, and chapels; building churches, palaces, and at times sumptuous suburban villas, such as the Farnese villa at Caprarola and the Este villa at Tivoli, with costly investments in the luxurious furnishings that filled them. This was precisely what Paolo Cortesi had prescribed in his *De cardinalatu*, published in 1510, stating among other things that the homes of members of the College of Cardinals should accommodate a *familia* of about sixty people, in addition to some eighty servants. [114] In his judgment, therefore, a cardinal needed an annual income of at least 12,000 scudi to maintain an appropriate standard of living. [115] This was a substantial sum, although it amounted to no more than a tenth of the yearly income of the cardinal of Guise, Charles of Lorraine, or Alessandro Farnese. In 1571 the latter drew 76,750 scudi from ecclesiastical benefices alone, while two years earlier his other revenues had brought his total to 95,538 scudi; by 1589, the year of his death, it had risen to 120,000. This was more than ten percent of the total income of the College of Cardinals and comparable only to the revenues of Ippolito d'Este, estimated at no less than 75,000 to 80,000 scudi. [116] Although committed to an austerity that extended throughout his household, after the conclusion of the Council of Trent Carlo Borromeo could count on revenues exceeding 50,000 scudi, enabling him to sustain his munificent charitable and relief work. [117]

Entirely anachronistic, therefore, was the opinion of so rigorous a pope as Adrian VI, according to whom a cardinal residing in Rome needed at least 4,000 scudi a year. That amount represented rather a genuine poverty line, since various proposals set a minimum income at 6,000 scudi, below which papal aid would be

required. A common priest or schoolmaster, it should be remembered, lived on two or three scudi a month. [118] Certainly, for the most illustrious cardinals, whose red hats were accompanied by the coats of arms of great princely houses, such sums also came from private fortunes. Above all, however, they derived from ecclesiastical revenues, first and foremost benefices, pensions, and commendatory abbeys, as well as curial offices and the papal subsidy later known as the cardinal's plate. Recourse to debt was therefore very common among members of the Sacred College, even the wealthiest, who were sometimes swept into a vortex of unsustainable expenditure. Although Niccolò Ridolfi had an annual income of 15,000 to 20,000 scudi, for example, he often spent still more and left his heirs debts variously estimated at between 13,000 and 21,000 scudi. [119] “I have always understood, and it has always been clear to me, | that silver enough for them is never possessed | by bishops, cardinals, or supreme pastors,” Ludovico Ariosto smiled in his satires. [120] There is no doubt that most cardinals believed it their duty to live like princes and that this standard could not be compromised, [121] not least because each cardinal's personal and political prestige was closely tied to his spending power and to the system of patronage it could sustain, directly or indirectly, through introductions, recommendations, requests for favours, exemptions, and privileges.

Morone's correspondence with the powerful offers constant examples: the Milanese authorities and Cosimo de' Medici; the princes and cardinals of the Este or Gonzaga houses and the rulers of Genoa or Venice; illustrious nobles and patricians of the Po Valley, other members of the Sacred College, bishops, and archbishops. Letters written and letters received, whose requests had to be taken up in a continual exercise of rank and power, whose strength and authority were displayed all the more effectively when they could break rules and obtain dispensations.

The documentation currently known does not allow us to calculate the sums Morone received from benefices and pensions over the course of his life. They undoubtedly varied considerably over time, but were in any case incomparable to those available to the scions of papal or princely families or to members of the great nobility and wealthy patriciates - the Caetani, Crescenzi, Colonna, Trivulzio, Grimani, Corner, and Salviati, to confine ourselves to this side of the Alps. Morone himself came from a distinguished Milanese family, but one considerably impoverished by the political crisis in which it had been both protagonist and victim. “I maintain a household, not a court,” he wrote on 24 June 1542, immediately after his elevation to the cardinalate, apologising to Beccadelli for his inability to take into his service a man whom Beccadelli had recommended. “At present I am so burdened with dependants and promises that I shall have to lighten the load.” [122] At first the income from the episcopal estate of Modena had been very modest, depleted until 1541 by a substantial pension. [123] It is difficult to establish the revenues of the titular churches and suburbicarian dioceses held by Morone from June 1542, when he entered the Sacred College: San Vitale until 1549, Santo Stefano al Celio until 1553, San Lorenzo in Lucina until 1556, Santa Maria in Trastevere until 1560, [124] then Albano until 1561, Sabina until 1562, Palestrina until 1564, Frascati until 1565, Porto until 1570, and Ostia until his death. [125] We do know, however, that in 1571 Ostia yielded him the considerable sum of 2,875 scudi. [126] Curial income was not negligible either. The so-called “ordinary provision” could amount to as much as 200 scudi a month for the “poor cardinals,” [127] and in Morone's case, by March 1554, it consisted of 95.5 scudi a month, the prescribed minimum - as for Cardinals Verallo, Medici, Pole, and Sermoneta - equivalent to about 1,150 scudi a year. [128]

Small sums also entered Morone's coffers through his participation in consistorial acts and the associated “distribution of the hat,” the so-called roll of the cardinal's hat: payments, settled every six months, of emoluments to cardinals actually present in Rome. [129] He also received the *propinae* due to those who, in consistorial sessions, proposed appointments to the greater benefices, a veritable “reserved hunting ground for the cardinals.” [130] He probably also relied on some modest income from lesser benefices [131] or from his role as cardinal protector of the many religious orders for which he held that office. [132] From the Cistercians, for example, in 1566 he received an annual pension of a little more than 520 scudi, payable in two instalments from the revenues of the abbey of Santa Maria Maddalena della Cava, later Cavatigozzi, in the outskirts of Cremona, whose commendam had been assigned to him in 1548. [133] The bulk of his income, however, came from substantial pensions charged on other episcopal revenues. Together with commendatory

abbeys, these were destined to replace the plurality of dioceses as the principal source of cardinalatial income, altering more in form than in substance the drainage and redistribution of financial resources in the post-Tridentine Curia after the conciliar decrees prohibiting the accumulation of benefices. [134]

The first pension of which there is evidence, already in the mid-1540s, was attached to the Benedictine abbey of San Pietro at Eboli in the diocese of Salerno. Its revenues of 1,500 scudi, however, had been assigned to Pietro Carnesecchi, [135] a fact the inquisitors would later use as evidence of Morone's complicity during the trial brought against him by Paul IV, when he was urged to surrender the pension in favour of the Theatine cardinal Bernardino Scotti. [136] In August 1553 Morone appears as commendatory abbot of the Benedictine abbey of Santa Maria and Santo Stefano del Piano at Calvello, in the Marsica, although the resources of the two recently united religious institutions must have been quite modest. [137] The same was true of the income from “certain properties in the territory of Fontanella,” in the diocese of Cremona, deriving from the commendam of Santa Maria Maddalena at La Cava assigned to him in 1548 after his withdrawal from the Bolognese legation. [138] When Cardinal Federico Cesi was finally installed in the episcopal see of Cremona in 1551, after Charles V's initial refusal to grant the *placet*, an annual pension of 1,500 scudi was established for Morone, perhaps absorbing the abbey commendam. [139]

At the time of his death in 1580, Morone was receiving 2,000 scudi from the revenues of two wealthy Spanish dioceses, Burgos and Jaén; 1,500 from Bergamo; 1,000 from Vicenza; [140] and another 1,400 from Modena: just under 6,000 scudi in all, [141] although such pensions were notoriously often paid late, sometimes by many months. The pension on the rich diocese of Burgos had been established on 27 June 1550, [142] when Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla was appointed to the see, together with pensions of 2,000 scudi each for Cardinals Ercole Gonzaga and Reginald Pole. [143] The Vicenza pension likewise dated from 1550, on 17 March, [144] as did that from Modena, when Morone resigned the diocese in favour of Egidio Foscarari. The Jaén pension was granted in 1555, and that of Bergamo probably in 1577. [145]

The new Spanish pension assigned to Morone in 1555 undoubtedly resulted from the insistence with which the Spanish ambassador Juan Manrique de Lara had long praised to Charles V the daily services rendered by that able and loyal cardinal, a subject of the House of Austria, who was nevertheless so poor that he sometimes lacked food. Hence Manrique's suggestion that Charles should give him and the other cardinals most faithful to the Catholic monarchy a substantial reward. Others, he wrote on 10 February 1554, could be gratified with little because they were useful only briefly; a man like Morone, always useful and possessed of such merits, should be given something that would simply free him from poverty. [146] A few months later, on 18 May, probably through Cardinal Granvelle, Morone was informed that, in view of everything Manrique had continually written about his devotion, one of his existing pensions would be increased. [147] Finally, between September 1552 and March 1560 the Milanese cardinal was bishop of Novara, whose revenues of a little over 2,000 scudi he could enjoy without deductions, although upon appointment he had to surrender the pension of 1,500 scudi charged on the diocese of Cremona that had been granted him in March of the previous year. [148] It was therefore Julius III, soon after the conclave that elected him, who provided Morone with new and substantial revenues worth more than 5,000 scudi - Burgos, Vicenza, Modena, Cremona, and then Novara. [149] When Pope Pius V requested a contribution for the war against the Turk in 1571, Morone declared that he received 4,500 scudi in pensions from ecclesiastical benefices, all tax exempt. [150]

To these receipts, in an inextricable mingling of ecclesiastical and private revenues, were added the rents from a property at Ostia, amounting to the considerable sum of 1,050 scudi per quarter - evidence of prudent management - as well as other unspecified landed income from the “Community of Sutri” [151] and from family estates in Lombardy, at Niguarda and Rovederio. These cannot have been insignificant, since in 1576, shortly after obtaining from Pope Gregory XIII the *facultas testandi*, [152] he sold them to his brother Sforza for no less than 36,000, or perhaps 38,000, ducats. This formed part of a series of property transactions also involving Marchioness Anna Morone Stampa and perhaps including fictitious sales and payments. [153] We know nothing of the income Morone drew from the right of collation to ecclesiastical benefices in the diocese of Como, granted him in 1560, [154] and little more about how his finances were supported during his numerous, often lengthy and expensive diplomatic missions to Germany between the 1530s and 1570s, or during his

Bolognese legation in the 1540s. [155] For his presidency of the council in 1563, we know only that he received 1,000 scudi for the journey and another 1,000 a month as “provision.” [156] For his final legation to Regensburg the monthly sum rose to 1,500, while he also received 3,000 scudi for preparations. [157] These were extraordinary revenues, of course, intended to meet extraordinary expenditure. One must also deduct the ordinary and extraordinary levies imposed even on members of the Sacred College “who labour continually in the service of God and the public good,” including Morone, “who toils more than all the others, [...] burdened by more than a thousand scudi a year,” as Tolomeo Gallio wrote in July 1572. [158]

These figures nevertheless indicate an income above the 12,000 scudi a year recommended by Paolo Cortesi, although pensions whose amount cannot be calculated were themselves charged on those ecclesiastical benefices. Some were drawn on the revenues of the abbey of San Marziano in the diocese of Tortona, [159] which later passed as a kind of family property to Galeazzo Morone, his second cousin, *iuris utriusque doctor*, appointed bishop of Macerata in 1573 and deceased in 1613. [160] In 1555, moreover, Cardinal Pole's annual income was likewise believed to reach 12,000 scudi, though this covered only two-thirds of his immense expenses as papal legate in England and had therefore to be supplemented by substantial resources assigned by Queen Mary. [161]

At the end of the century, a cardinal of wide artistic and cultural interests such as Francesco Maria Del Monte, one of Rome's leading art collectors, was likewise endowed after his elevation in 1588 with benefices worth the fateful 12,000 scudi a year. [162] A survey of cardinalatial incomes drawn up in Rome in 1571, in preparation for an extraordinary tax to finance the fleet that would fight at Lepanto, shows that the Sacred College then received a total of about 1,000,000 scudi a year. The cardinal of Lorraine drew 130,000; Alessandro Farnese more than 76,000; Ippolito d'Este more than 70,000; Cristoforo Madruzzo almost 45,000; Giulio Della Rovere just under 30,000; Marco Sittich von Altemps 25,000; and Carlo Borromeo almost 20,000. Morone's annual income was estimated at 9,838 scudi, including 4,000 not further specified in the source; 2,875 from the bishopric of Ostia; 3,565 from the bishopric of Modena; 667 from the abbey of Frassinoro, likewise in the Modenese diocese; about 1,696 from the abbey of San Marziano of Tortona; and 805 from the provostship of San Pietro in Monforte, Milan. The provostship of Carate Brianza, also in the diocese of Milan, yielded another 230 scudi a year. His income was thus comparable to, though slightly higher than, that of cardinals such as Giacomo Savelli or Innico d'Avalos d'Aragona; it exceeded Scipione Rebiba's by about thirty percent and was roughly twice that of Otto Truchsess von Waldburg. [163] Yet a *Relatione della corte di Roma* of 1574 described Morone as a “poor cardinal, who never importuned the pontiffs to give him anything, but devoted all his skill solely to overcoming envy and ill will.” [164] This also affords a glimpse of his ability to construct and project an image of himself.

It should nevertheless be stressed that this accumulation of ecclesiastical revenues and pensions remained entirely untouched not only by the recommendations of the Tridentine fathers, whose decrees on this subject were to remain substantially a dead letter, [165] but also by the reforming demands of previous decades, beginning with the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, in which Morone himself had been personally involved. The inventory of his revenues drawn up after his death thus presents an image very far removed from that of the young and energetic nuncio who had become Contarini's follower at the Diet of Regensburg in 1541, and then the cardinal “enlightened” on the doctrine of grace and justification by Flaminio and Pole during the journey to Trent at the end of 1542. [166] There is no doubt that the proceedings opened against him by the Roman Holy Office in the early 1550s, culminating in his long imprisonment in Castel Sant'Angelo from 1557 to 1559, played a decisive role in weakening and finally extinguishing those reforming impulses, which had nonetheless influenced the government of his dioceses. Much - and in his case too much - water had passed under the bridge for a man of such political intelligence not to grasp the meaning of what had occurred between the 1540s and the 1560s: the emergence of a renewal of the Church founded not on the doctrinal openness and irenic illusions that had animated earlier hopes, but on Roman centralism, controversialist theology, inquisitorial rigour, and a pastoral programme of obedience. In the essentially curial destination ultimately reached by the last president of the Council of Trent, the *fidei catholicae propugnator* whom some still believed “tainted by Lutheran matters,” [167] one can measure yet again the

fragility both of Tridentine reformism and of the Valdesian reformism of his mentor Reginald Pole, who died in London in 1558 “regarded in Rome as a Lutheran and in Germany as a papist.” [168]

Chapter Eleven

“To Put Right All the Disorders of the Priests”: The Novara Episcopate and Don Lorenzo Davidico

1. A New Diocese

The commission on the council established by Julius III on 19 April 1550 - comprising Carafa, Crescenzi, De Cupis, Morone, Pole, and Sfondrati - recommended a new convocation at Trent. [1] Despite the discouraging signals received from the nuncios to the emperor and the king of France, the pontiff finally decided to summon it by a bull published on 1 January 1551, setting 1 May for the opening of the synod. Only a few days later, however, on 7 May, the treaty signed by Henry of Valois and Ottavio Farnese opened the War of Parma. French armies reappeared in Italy and conflict with Charles V resumed, making it impossible for the synod to meet. The assembly began work only in September and concluded in April of the following year with the approval of important decrees on the sacraments, which had in fact already been drafted during the Bolognese phase. [2] Confronted simultaneously with war and council, papal diplomacy had to deploy its finest resources. Morone, in poor health, [3] did not figure among them on this occasion, perhaps also because the pope was unwilling to deprive himself of his advice at so delicate a political moment. In January 1552, for example, Paolo Giovio praised one of Morone's “most prudent and judicious replies,” hoping that this “good lord [...] may not prove a prophet of the evils that could befall Christendom.” At the end of March, writing from Pisa to thank him for a favour received, Giovio called him a man “of deeds, not words,” who was certainly not standing “with his hands at his belt amid this terrible danger to the bark of Peter.” [4]

On 12 September 1552, a little more than a month after the Peace of Passau, which by revoking the Augsburg Interim marked Charles V's definitive defeat in Germany, Julius III signed the brief appointing Morone bishop of Novara, in his Milanese homeland. [5] The appointment may also have been intended to remove him, at least for a time, from the murky atmosphere of rivalry, resentment, and low intrigue that prevailed in Rome after the sensational discovery that the Holy Office had secretly opened proceedings against him and Pole in defiance of explicit papal orders. It is highly probable that both men learned of the insidious scheme devised against them by the supreme inquisitors, which Julius III, as we shall see, only narrowly succeeded in thwarting. [6] In any event, the episode must be borne in mind in order to understand the Milanese cardinal's conduct during his stay in Lombardy in 1552-53. He may already have been there “to visit his aged mother” and his sister, [7] since on 8 October 1552 Giovio sent him a volume of his *Historiae* in Milan. [8] As soon as he learned of his appointment, he sent his brother Sforza to catch up with Ferrante Gonzaga, who had just departed, [9] both to secure the imperial *placet* for possession of the diocese and to pursue several “private affairs,” including a dispute over property at Alessandria that he claimed had been usurped from him. [10]

The governor informed him that he would have to apply directly to Charles V. Morone did so in the letter to Granvelle cited above, though he did not conceal his bitterness at finding that even he, “who am so clearly a servant of His Majesty, should be included in this general rule.” Meanwhile, he made his voice heard at the Habsburg court, asking that Novara not be burdened with new obligations “contrary to custom and to the terms of its privileges.” [11] At the end of October the cardinal sent another “gentleman to kiss Don Ferrante's hand,” asking him to report as soon as possible whether and when the emperor's *placet* had arrived. The wait was brief. By 15 November Morone was thanking him for having “greatly facilitated and accelerated this dispatch,” announced in a letter from Granvelle informing him of Charles V's immediate consent, lest the reservations the emperor had expressed in the past “concerning possession of such churches” be extended also to Morone, “in whom His Majesty has the fullest confidence,” Granvelle reassured him. [12] The reference was plainly to the refusal of the *placet* for Federico Cesi's appointment to the diocese of Cremona, where the Brussels court would have preferred the Milanese Giovanni Morone himself. [13] There was therefore no

difficulty over Novara. On 28 November 1552 Gonzaga informed the city authorities and urged them to receive the new bishop or his procurators “with all appropriate aid and favour.” [14]

Shortly thereafter, in early December, Morone entered Novara and took possession of the bishopric and the associated fief of the Riviera d'Orta. His immediate predecessors in 1550-51, Ippolito d'Este and Giulio Della Rovere - both cardinals and scions of princely families - had distinguished themselves chiefly by their absence. Morone therefore wished here too to signal a change, as his household member Alessandro Olocati would later recall: “I know with what reverence and dignity he entered that bishopric, and how alms immediately began to be distributed every day, and how at once he resolved to put right all the disorders of the priests.” [15] Two days before Christmas the cardinal himself informed Granvelle of his intention to remain at Novara “until it seems to me that I have set the affairs of this bishopric on the proper course, as is my duty; and since I possess a little jurisdiction nearby, I shall order it in such a way that it will always be ready for the service of the state of His Imperial Majesty.” [16] Yet inwardly he continued to look toward high international politics, and especially toward Germany, whose schism and religious fragmentation seemed to him the principal problem Rome had to address within the broader prospect of a serious reform of the Church. This is attested by a letter Ercole Gonzaga wrote him on 13 November 1552. From Mantua he expressed pleasure that Morone had appreciated “this small service I have begun to render you by sending copies of what I learn here about German affairs,” promising to keep him informed and “sending you the enclosed reports I have lately received.” [17]

Morone remained in Lombardy until August of the following year. [18] It was only a matter of months, but still a sign of pastoral zeal, since, as had already happened at Modena, his onerous curial duties and the gathering inquisitorial storm over his head made his presence in Rome necessary. He would not be able to return in later years, much less reside in the diocese, which he eventually resigned in 1560, without having altered its long tradition of absentee bishops. An austere reformer such as Reginaldo Nerli did not hesitate to express frank reservations about Morone's acceptance of the see: “It is true that, just as I was edified when he relinquished the bishopric of Modena, so I was astonished when he accepted the bishopric of Novara.” [19] His intention to confront the grave problems afflicting this vast diocese is nevertheless attested by the *Aedicta sive constitutiones* he had printed at Novara on 25 January 1553 in his capacity as perpetual administrator. [20] It was customary for new bishops, upon taking office, to issue directives of this kind, often copied verbatim from those of their predecessors and thereby revealing their essential ineffectiveness. Morone himself had done so twenty years earlier when taking possession of Modena, to inform the canons and secular clergy with care of souls what he expected of them. [21] He acted similarly at Novara, intending to enforce the rules of the sacred canons, restore clerical discipline, and combat the many abuses that had long taken root.

The text was divided into two parts, *De cultu divino* and *De vita et honestate clericorum*, and specified in detail the penalties to be imposed on offenders. The first reiterated the need for scrupulous observance of liturgical norms, recalling the canons to their duties: above all, not to disrupt services by chatting about idle matters unrelated to worship, always to wear the prescribed vestments, and not to come and go at will. It established precise rules for the celebration of Mass, the cleanliness of sacred furnishings, preaching, the appointment of priests, the administration of the sacraments and their protection and veneration - including safeguards to prevent wicked persons from using them for sacrilegious and superstitious purposes - the keeping of baptismal registers, and the possession of pastoral manuals, confession guides, and *summae* of cases of conscience. Other norms sought to eradicate widespread simoniacal practices by ordering all parish priests not to demand money for administering the sacraments; to suppress the circulation of heterodox books and doctrines; to supervise the administration of confraternities and charitable institutions; to impose a minimum level of education on the clergy; and to prevent their most intolerable misconduct, such as blasphemy or selling chalices, vestments, and other goods to the highest bidder.

In the second part - though the problems were inextricably intertwined - the *constitutiones* dealt with tonsures and unkempt beards; clothing, including prohibitions on silk or embroidered stockings and shirts, multicoloured garments, feathered or gilded hats, and indecent attire; the habit of bearing arms; attending dances or wearing masks; roaming at night making music; hunting; engaging in trade or notarial work;

practising base occupations; or keeping an inn. Priests were ordered to reside at their benefices so as to provide the cure of souls and supervise the morality and religious practices of the faithful. They were to abstain from brawling and obscene speech, not enlist as mercenaries, cohabit with women, enter convents of women without a special licence, or solicit alms by tricks and lies that deceived poor people. This impressive catalogue of abuses, inveterate practices, ignorance, and confusion between sacred and profane, even before it attests a will to reform, offers a picture of an anomic religious life without pastoral discipline, institutional organisation, or hierarchical control, in which it is difficult to perceive the sharp line between clergy and laity that the post-Tridentine Church would seek to impose. Morone concluded that it was impossible to list every abuse. He understood that such degradation had long been entrenched and became ever more endemic the farther one penetrated into peripheral areas; any work of renewal would therefore have to confront first and foremost the clergy's grave deficiencies.

As far as he was able, Morone himself sought to set an example. “I have come here to visit these valleys of my diocese, which need it, and I shall spend several days here,” he wrote on 15 April 1553 from the Island of San Giulio d'Orta to Beccadelli, then nuncio in Venice. [22] He was still there on 25 May, recovered from an attack of gout and ready to leave for Milan “once I have given some form to these affairs of the priests” and to their “disorders.” [23] The clergy's inadequacy for the cure of souls and administration of sacred things thus represented the gravest obstacle to any effort at reform. It was therefore necessary to begin there, perhaps by seeking elsewhere the collaborators the local environment could not supply. With remarkable precocity in comparison with the Italian episcopate as a whole, this was precisely the direction Morone gave his action during the few months in which he was able to reside at Novara, drawing on his earlier experience in Modena.

Among the new bishop's first acts - he had already appointed Domenico Morando and Girolamo Parisetto, both long among his closest collaborators, as procurators on 26 November [24] - was the designation of a new vicar. On 19 January 1553 he chose Giovanni Giorgio Parravicino, who came from Como, where he had exercised the same function in previous years and acquired the necessary experience. [25] Yet the gravity of the situation suggested the need for additional forces and instruments of action. Morone summoned other priests to Novara, above all to begin a visitation of the churches in the countryside and Alpine valleys, whose isolation merely aggravated neglect, deficiency, and abuses of every kind. Several years later Morando, then Morone's household steward, recalled that immediately after arriving at Novara his patron realised that, “wishing to provide for the care of his bishopric, both the diocese and the city, he needed ministers.” [26] He therefore approached the new congregations of regular clergy that were attracting fresh and vigorous energies of religious renewal. One example was the Jesuits, to whom Morone, drawing on his experience of them in Germany, wrote in early summer 1553. On 29 July Ignatius of Loyola replied that they were already overburdened and “had greater need to seek men to carry forward enterprises already begun than any opportunity to send them to a new place.” Besides declining the request, Ignatius reproached Morone for allowing the pastoral cares of his Lombard diocese to distract him by keeping him away from Rome, where he no longer concerned himself - as he evidently had in the past - with the Society's needs in evangelising Corsica, ransoming captives in Muslim lands, and above all, as we shall see, supporting the Roman College. [27]

Perhaps even before approaching the Jesuits, the cardinal also turned to the Barnabites, the young Milanese religious order whose fervent spiritualism, learned in the school of Battista da Crema, had aroused early suspicions and led to an inquiry that Paul III had entrusted to Morone himself in 1536. Morone had nevertheless then been able to appreciate their devotional fervour and ascetic rigour. [28] Those suspicions remained alive in the early 1550s and were further aggravated by the virtual cult these Milanese clerics paid to their *mater et magistra*, the Angelic nun Paola Antonia Negri. They culminated in an inquisitorial trial which, by condemning Negri and confining her in a convent, marked a radical turning point in the order's history and ultimately drew it into the channel of Borromean piety. [29] The records of the general chapters of the small Milanese congregation note Morone's request, which it preferred to evade, perhaps also because of the inquisitorial investigation then under way in Rome. “Nevertheless, we stand ready to do the little we can

in order to do something pleasing to God and to Your Most Reverend Lordship and useful to souls," he was told on 7 July 1553. [30]

It is possible that the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul themselves suggested that he summon Don Lorenzo Davidico, born Lorenzo Castellino, a priest from Vercelli who had given them no small trouble. His ambitions to sanctity - reflected even in the name he had chosen - were wholly disproportionate to his meagre ethical discipline, unscrupulous opportunism, and constant acts of disobedience, which eventually led to his expulsion from the order. [31] After only a few years, once the first enthusiasm that had led Zaccaria himself to call him his "divine priest" [32] and to use him in Barnabite missions at Vicenza and Verona had faded, Don Lorenzo brought one disappointment after another to his superiors. As early as January 1545 the chapter denounced his "great desire for liberty and ambition" and his "many failings against obedience," enumerating his vices and faults one by one: "Full of suspicions, [...] captive to vainglory, [...] full of infidelity toward obedience, full of duplicity, full of self-love, [...] full of the conviction that he knows and can do things, such as preach, convert souls, compose writings, and rise to greatness, as for example to episcopal dignity, [...] full of excuses and duplicity, without contrition." [33] The humiliating mortifications imposed on him then did not induce him to change course. In November of the following year he was still not admitted to profession of vows and, despite a renewed pledge to reform, was judged "fuller than ever of duplicity, outright lies, deceptions, infidelity, presumption, and wilfulness." [34]

New penances and new relapses merely confirmed his brethren and superiors in the conviction that he was wholly incapable of accepting the congregation's strict discipline. He was definitively expelled in March 1547. This did not prevent him from continuing to deploy his little stratagems and great lies in order to present himself as an uncompromising Catholic, boast of crowds of devoted followers, especially at Perugia, claim knowledge of obscure heretical plots, and publish some fifty devotional booklets, all more or less alike. These plundered the writings of Fra Battista da Crema without grasping their implicit spiritualist radicalism, reducing them instead to lashing invectives against the "lukewarm," whom he urged toward penitential asceticism, anti-heretical militancy, and devotional zeal. In later years he would make every effort - including seeking the support of Saint Ignatius - to re-enter the small Barnabite community which, always recalled now with anger and now with nostalgia, had nevertheless left an indelible mark on his religious experience.

It is therefore more likely that Morone's choice was independent and motivated by his direct acquaintance with Davidico. The latter would say that he had met Morone in Bologna during the legation and had spoken with him at length in private during the Easter festivities. On that occasion the cardinal allegedly delivered a long discourse on the "grace of Jesus Christ," which Davidico would describe several years later as seeming "to exclude works, weaken free will, and conform, at least in the sound of the words, to the language of so many Lutherans." [35] Davidico's inveterate propensity to lie prevents us from assigning much credit to this testimony. Yet it appears to attest Morone's confidence in the Vercellese priest, who shortly afterward - proof that he had not been so greatly scandalised by the cardinal's words - dedicated to him the second edition of his *Trattato della communione*, published in Florence in 1550. It is probable that the newly appointed bishop of Novara came to believe the image Don Lorenzo presented of himself in those pages, where, he wrote, "many who waver are confirmed, beginners are warned of many things, and the more advanced are spurred to a greater desire for holy communion; here is contained what is required in one who wishes to communicate, the manner of preparing oneself, and many notable passages against the lukewarm and the Lutherans." [36] During these years the Vercellese priest repeatedly lived in Rome, producing devotional booklets one after another: six in 1550 alone, two more in 1551, and four the following year, totalling nearly four thousand pages in those years alone and bearing witness to his prolific verbosity.

Alongside this frenetic activity, Davidico engaged in the struggle against heresy in many Italian cities and in the Valtellina. This earned him appointment as an apostolic preacher by a brief of Julius III dated 12 September 1550. He used the office, together with his writings, to gather around himself a group of devotees scattered through central and northern Italy, revealing an ambition to follow in his masters' footsteps and become the charismatic centre of an embryonic religious congregation. Davidico and Morone probably

became better acquainted in 1551-52, when the expulsion of the Pauline communities from Venice, the condemnation of Fra Battista's works, the trial of Paola Antonia Negri, [37] and the severe measures taken by the Holy Office against the Angelics and Barnabites perhaps provided an opportunity for the cardinal and Don Lorenzo to meet. Davidico was personally involved in those events, since he took it upon himself to denounce the anomalous conduct of his former companions, thereby finding an outlet for his resentment. The Vercellese priest would later depict their encounter as the beginning of immediate "familiarity," such that Morone made attractive promises to help him concretely at the first opportunity, enabling him at last to settle somewhere and put his "talent" to use. [38] His Vercellese origins, moreover, made him particularly well suited to operate in the social and linguistic environment of nearby Novara.

2. Don Lorenzo Davidico

At the end of 1552 Davidico was in Perugia, where he read passages from his works - perhaps the *Sperone de' tepidi* or the *Fatto de arme interiore*, recently printed in the Umbrian city - to a "company" of devoted followers prepared to accept the disciplinary rules and severe penances he imposed. To them he preached "certain spiritual paradoxes which I am sure would scarcely please theologians, very similar to those of Fra Battista da Crema," the Jesuit Everard Mercurian wrote to Rome on 17 December. He was worried by the "very great authority" this disturbing figure had acquired among those most responsive to demands for renewal: "As for ecclesiastical doctrines, I have heard from him things both false and highly scandalous." [39] Morone's invitation to move to Novara reached Davidico in early spring 1553 at Foligno, where he had gone to preach during Lent. It came in an "affectionate letter" delivered together with another from Alvise Priuli, "which likewise urged me to make that journey." [40] Davidico had known and frequented Pole's friend and collaborator since 1550, and in the spring of 1552 had dedicated to him his *Gioiello del vero christiano*. The invitation reflected both Morone's wish to offer Davidico a concrete sign of esteem - the latter desired nothing more than to find "a permanent place, without further hardship" - and his intention to begin reforming the diocese, "judging him a suitable man to conduct the visitation." Only a few months later the cardinal would bitterly regret not having listened to Morando, who had immediately voiced doubts about this ambiguous figure, "having known him in Rome, in our house, where he sometimes came, presumptuous and shameless." [41]

Before setting out, however, Don Lorenzo wished to go to Rome to have printed a harsh controversialist booklet, the *Candore della catholica verità*. He dedicated it to the Milanese cardinal as evidence of Morone's "living zeal [...] for the honour of God and universal reformation," as well as of his rigorous commitment against "Lutheran tares and heretical depravity." [42] These words perhaps clarify how Davidico interpreted Morone's invitation to preach at Novara "with particular instructions to instruct that diocese": above all as a commission "to enlighten those souls according to Catholic doctrine." [43] Soon afterward, following a route that led from Orvieto and Perugia as far as Rimini, [44] the former Barnabite travelled toward the Lombard city. He arrived "with one companion on horseback and a servant on foot," after meeting the cardinal on the Island of San Giulio d'Orta at the end of March. [45] Morando received him at Novara, gave him lodging, and, in response to his request "for many things to provide for his life," supplied what seemed "appropriate, although [...] he did not appear wholly satisfied." [46] On 27 April Morone signed his appointment as rural vicar of the Val d'Ossola, with responsibility for administering spiritual justice, and by another decree appointed him lieutenant, rural vicar, and visitor of churches [47] throughout the Val d'Ossola, Riviera d'Orta, Omegna, Lake Maggiore, and Val Sesia, with broad powers to do everything he considered "expedient." [48]

Davidico would later recall his conversations with the cardinal, who allegedly told him in "affectionate words that he loved me and thanked me for the work I had done and was doing in preaching and other good works." Morone promised him "a good provision" of 500 scudi [49] and allowed him to glimpse the possibility of obtaining an ecclesiastical benefice and even appointment as a suffragan bishop. [50] Still distrustful of him, Morando reminded him on that occasion that Morone intended "to provide remedies for many disorders he has found in this diocese," and that Davidico would therefore have to observe two rules strictly: "First, you

must abstain from every kind of avarice; second, you must preserve an honest life and proper conduct with every sort of person." [51] This, however, was not what occurred.

As soon as he was formally invested with the office of rural vicar, Davidico set out, with the primary task of enforcing even in those poor Alpine valleys the *constitutiones* issued by the new bishop. By 30 April he was already at Pieve Vergonte, [52] about twelve kilometres from Domodossola; on 23 May he was nearby at Vogogna, where he sentenced to the galleys a priest guilty of grave offences. [53] By mid-June he was at Intra on the shore of Lake Maggiore, [54] energetically carrying out his mission despite "the tremendous heat of the summer." [55] Abundant documentation concerning this visitation, the problems he encountered, and the methods by which he thought they should be addressed is supplied by the trial held at Novara in the summer of 1553. Its purpose was to establish the truth of the complaints and denunciations made against Davidico, who was accused of every kind of embezzlement, bullying, and abuse against the very priests he was supposed to lead back to the right path. Beyond his own offences, petty and grave, what emerges most forcefully from these papers is the wretched reality - wholly resistant to Morone's *Aedicta sive constitutiones* - of the clergy entrusted with guiding consciences and administering sacred things in the age of Trent, now a generation after the Wittenberg theses and the sack of Rome.

"The whole of that country is unworthy of me, and I of them!" With these blunt words Don Lorenzo would later express the anger he had accumulated against those priests, "many of them peasants forty times over, and ungrateful for their true good," who after the visitation had sought to involve the bishop in "false" and "unjust calumnies" concerning his conduct. [56] In a short dialogue written some time later to present his own version of events, the difficult world over which he had tried to exercise authority for a few months was portrayed as lawless, resistant to every constituted power, and everywhere traversed by violence, rebellion, and heresy: [57]

> The priests are swordsmen, faction leaders, ignorant men, and concubinaries; the laymen are so insolent that the Senate of Milan has never been able to bring them to reason, however many measures it has taken. The perversity of that country is known throughout the city of Milan, which despairs of its spiritual cure; and there are also many Lutherans there. Had I pretended not to see their abuses, vices, errors, and disorders, I would have had many friends. But because I set myself firmly against them with punishments, regulations, and preaching, they all turned against me.

"Things in those parts have fallen so far through the negligence of past superiors," he would conclude, "that few possess a conscience." Everywhere there were "disorders"; everywhere priests worthy of punishment "for their evil lives"; everywhere "illicit profits of notaries"; everywhere "insolent Lutherans"; everywhere "vices, errors, and abuses" against which, he claimed, he had tried in vain "to introduce some reform." [58] There were "untamed" people and "mad brains," especially in the Val d'Ossola, ready to follow the example of their pastors, who refused to appear at the chapter he had summoned and did not hesitate to shelter under the protection of secular power, risking delicate jurisdictional disputes. [59] Everywhere there were acts of violence involving members of the clergy, some of whom had joined "outlaws in mountainous places with weapons on their shoulders." [60] In the house of one of them, "a madman [...] who handles weapons more than the missal or breviary," Davidico confiscated "a partisan, a sword, and a firearm," although he was not the only priest to keep a well-stocked arsenal. [61]

Everywhere there were abuses of every kind; everywhere concubinary priests, [62] "dissolute," "scandalous, and of evil life," the very embodiment of "ignorance itself"; wealthy, arrogant canons who "failed greatly in the affairs of the church, according to the universal accusation of the people"; [63] everywhere sacred furnishings in disastrous condition: missals with pages "limp, ruined, and greasy," "filthy" corporals, broken and chipped chalices, baptismal fonts covered in cobwebs or missing altogether, consecrated hosts not kept under lock and key, and "notable irreverence [...] toward the most holy sacrament." [64]

The situation was therefore dramatic. Yet despite the noble image of himself Davidico would later seek to project, he tried less to correct it than to exploit it for his own benefit. Extortion, threats, blackmail, bullying, and levies marked the journey of Morone's rural vicar through the valleys of upper Novara. Here too the records of the bishop's subsequent inquiry provide unequivocal evidence: lavish meals at inns; [65] veritable

plunder of “bread, wine, fat, and cheese” in the houses of priests where he lodged; [66] threats with fists raised to their faces; [67] boasts of influence, claiming that he could count on “great friends” or even that he wielded “three swords, one of the king of France, another of the emperor, and another of His Holiness, and that he could hang and unhang whomever he wished”; [68] judgments sold at high prices; releases from prison purchased with cash; arbitrary sentences and excommunications; continual extortion of money; and purchases left unpaid. [69] “I take money from everyone and serve my friend,” Davidico allegedly declared with brazen frankness. He discouraged those whom he was supposed to supervise and reform from appealing to the bishop's authority - “I laugh heartily at that” - intimidating them by invoking the “intimate and Christian union” he claimed to have with “Monsignor himself,” and urging them not to waste time on “tales” but to “keep your wits about you, because when the cardinal leaves I shall remain.” [70] Don Domenico Morando would later also accuse Davidico “of having solicited two young men for sodomy.” [71]

There was thus more than enough for grumbling, complaints, and accusations of every kind to reach Morone's ears. The cardinal had left for Milan in June, but remained in close contact with the collaborators to whom he entrusted management of this delicate affair. [72] On 27 July he had an edict proclaimed announcing his intention to subject Davidico's conduct to formal review and placing him under arrest. [73] Francesco Prepositi, provost of San Giulio d'Orta, was commissioned to investigate the places where Davidico had operated and to invite everyone to report “every extortion and injury done to them by the aforesaid Lord Lorenzo, and all money extorted by him in whatever manner,” with a promise of swift and rigorous justice. [74] There is no need here to follow the proceedings in detail. They were entrusted to the bishop's vicar and auditor, Giovanni Giorgio Parravicino and Girolamo Parisetto, who acted rapidly and collected numerous depositions. [75] Davidico tried to defend himself by invoking his inexperience, the hostile atmosphere he had encountered, the clergy's obstinate rejection of every reform, their anger at the sentences he had imposed, and their desire for revenge. Though overwhelmed by accusations, he did not hesitate to say that he was ready to entrust himself to his “sweet Christ” and repel his accusers “with the sword of truth: let the world say what it will, for I care nothing for its foolish tales, because *gloria mea haec est: testimonium conscientiae meae* [this is my glory: the testimony of my conscience].” [76]

Morone had no alternative but to bring this unpleasant affair to an end as quickly as possible and rid himself of a troublesome and embarrassing figure who had discredited the reforming commitment with which he had taken possession of the diocese. His return to Rome was now imminent. In preparation for it, on 11 August 1553 he appointed Don Domenico Morando commissioner and general lieutenant of the vicar in the spiritual and temporal government of the diocese. [77] After relieving Don Lorenzo *in toto* of the duties previously assigned to him, [78] the cardinal ordered the tribunal he had established to conclude the inquiry, during which the accused's position had steadily worsened. [79] His attempt to shift blame to others, his promise to return to his “customary spiritual studies,” and his renunciation of a formal defence did little good. [80] With his back to the wall, on 14 August Davidico finally submitted a confession of greater or lesser sincerity. In a signed declaration he admitted “having erred and fallen into many improprieties through my lack of experience in government and knowledge of the laws, and also through weakness in my anger”; acknowledged that he deserved “no small punishment”; asked for “mercy and not justice”; and entrusted himself to the bishop's compassion. [81] The same day, as evidence of good faith, he returned seven scudi improperly taken from a priest, while new charges continued to reach the episcopal court. [82]

On 17 August Morone was at Cusago, very near Milan, formerly the marquisate of Massimiliano Stampa and then inherited by his wife Anna Morone, the cardinal's sister, who had settled there. From Cusago Morone informed Parisetto that he had decided to spare Davidico the extremely severe penalty he deserved. [83] This is confirmed by the sentence read before the Vercellese priest on 19 August. He was ordered to repay the episcopal estate the substantial sum of one hundred scudi, twenty-five of which had already been restored to those from whom it had been extorted, but was spared further and harsher canonical penalties in view of his submission to the tribunal's clemency and his inexperience. [84] In this way Don Lorenzo avoided prison; indeed the cardinal even gave him “several tens of scudi” to help him repay what he had wrongfully taken. [85]

Davidico was therefore probably able to leave Novara between the end of August and early September, though not before obtaining an authenticated copy of the trial records [86] with the intention of using them at the first opportunity. For a man of his kind - always wavering between edifying words and corrupt conduct, aspirations to sanctity and greed for worldly goods, willingness to do penance and bursts of anger, restless pursuit of spiritual guides and unbridled personal ambition - escaping punishment was acceptable while a severe sentence threatened him. Everything changed once he recovered his freedom. His irrepressible need for attention, his desire to cleanse his image of the discredit caused by that unedifying episode, and his extraordinary capacity for suppression would prompt him not to deny or conceal the events, but to revive them and even boast of them in order to present himself as a kind of persecuted martyr and thereby legitimise a furious desire for revenge. Already on the return journey to Rome, while in Milan, the Vercellese priest could not refrain from writing two or three “somewhat stinging” letters to the cardinal, filled with bitter words especially against Parisetto. Davidico claimed that Parisetto had “loaded me with wrongs in those troubles at Novara, seeing the persecutors favoured and myself abandoned.” In fact, the letters never reached their destination, because Bonaventura Castiglioni, commissioner of the Inquisition in the State of Milan, who had been entrusted with sending them, preferred to tear them up “for good reason.” [87]

A prisoner of the image of sanctity he strove everywhere to present, Davidico did everything possible to fuel the quarrel. Shortly after leaving Novara, while passing through Salò on Lake Garda, he spoke with Alvise Priuli, who was waiting to depart with Pole for the now Catholic kingdom of England. After inquiring about Davidico's conflict with Morone, Priuli allegedly did not conceal his concern over what Don Lorenzo knew of the religious convictions held by certain members of Pole's household. In great apprehension he asked him to observe the strictest secrecy concerning their “secrets” and made him promise “under oath” to respect the cardinal's honour. This was a genuine windfall for Davidico. He would not miss the opportunity to insinuate that those secrets concerned matters “of such importance that it is something more than saying purgatory is not in Scripture,” as was also shown, he claimed, by Priuli's invitation that he join their journey and the use of “every diligence and art” to persuade him. [88] Perhaps Priuli's embarrassment suggested to Davidico that suspicion of heresy would be the best weapon for revenge against Morone. All the more so because, if he is to be believed, shortly thereafter at Brescia an acquaintance asked about his troubles with the Milanese cardinal, adding with a smile that he had heard “strange things about him concerning our faith: what opinion do you have of him?” Davidico allegedly replied by lamenting the “great persecutions” and “troubles” he had suffered: “As for what you say, that he may be in some error concerning our faith, I cannot deny that I have entertained a somewhat unfavourable opinion of him, since many people have made him appear suspicious to me.” [89] Morone's supposed heretical deviations could thus become a precious religious cloak beneath which to hide the human wretchedness of this incurable opportunist disguised as a “reformed priest,” whose terrible reputation spread wherever he set foot. [90]

From the autumn of 1553 onward, Rome rather than Novara stood at the centre of the affair. A new and authoritative protagonist entered the scene in the form of the supreme tribunal of the faith, wholly uninterested in Don Lorenzo's petty thefts but intensely attentive to anything he might report about the Milanese cardinal.

It is possible, first of all, that the mild sentence Morone issued at Novara was also intended to placate this unpredictable figure and dissuade him from adopting hostile attitudes, spreading suspicions, and circulating insinuations that had in any case been current for some time. At the beginning of 1553, in Perugia, on the eve of his move to Novara, Davidico himself had been warned against accepting the cardinal's invitation. “Do not become involved with him, for you will regret it, because I hold him in such suspicion of heresy,” the inquisitor of the Umbrian city, the Dominican Matteo Lachi, told him “in secret.” [91] Shortly afterward, passing through Ferrara, a Modenese friend likewise urged him to withdraw, informing him that “among the Catholics of Modena there is talk about Cardinal Morone; his conduct does not satisfy them greatly.” [92]

A few weeks later, after meeting the Milanese cardinal, hearing “various words” from him, and observing his actions “minutely,” the Vercellese priest wrote to Lachi to confirm those suspicions: “About our friend you told me more than the truth.” [93] Later, at the end of January 1554, in another conversation with him at

Spoleto, Davidico attacked the powerful cardinal who had tried and dismissed him, reporting a whole series of “bad impressions,” [94] suspicious phrases, and disturbing statements that Morone supposedly uttered in his presence and even made the basis of precise pastoral instructions: “I would like you to preach Christ with the mysteries of the Gospel. [...] I would like you not to mix in or preach about saints, merits, and similar things, but Christ.” [95] These grave assertions allegedly provoked his immediate and scandalised reaction: “What are you telling me? What are these things? I am a Catholic and a son of the holy Roman Church. I will not preach otherwise than she has taught us.” They also prompted him to write the cardinal a letter “three full sheets long,” Lachi would recall, since Davidico showed him a copy, “in which he severely reproved the aforesaid most reverend Morone, showing him not only that His Most Reverend Lordship was a heretic, [...] but also that almost his entire household was filled with heretics.” [96]

In the heavy accusations Davidico chose to carry, based on a few fleeting encounters with the cardinal and the suspicions about him that he had picked up on various occasions, [97] one can discern not only, or even chiefly, a desire for revenge for what had happened at Novara, but also the need to provide his own version of those “differences,” as he would euphemistically call them, and of the true causes of the “many tribulations” he had been forced to endure. [98] At the root of his lies, in other words, lay an increasingly desperate attempt to recover some credibility by attributing his ignominious expulsion from the Lombard diocese to Morone's anger at his refusal to become the accomplice and instrument of heterodox propaganda, or even - as he would later maintain - to an attempt to strike down in his person one of the most authoritative persecutors of heresy then preaching in Italy. “Perhaps I did not sit sweetly in his stomach because my conduct did not accord with his taste.” Hence his conviction that, “if he was a Lutheran, as people said, [...] he had artfully summoned me to him, either to draw me into his designs concerning some opinion or to make some mockery or disgrace of me, as he later did, so that my preaching should no longer have credit.”

The clash had therefore been inevitable, with all the costs he had been forced to bear in remaining faithful to his mission as an intrepid defender of the faith. He considered it significant, moreover, that his presence in Rome aroused great fear among Morone's household, “as though they were afraid I might say something” about the cardinal, who for his part continually offered him “caresses” and promises. [99]

It was therefore at this time, at the end of 1553, [100] that the conversation took place which the Vercellese priest later reconstructed in a short writing. He recounted that, when he complained of the wrongs suffered at Novara, the cardinal replied: “The thing is done now; what do you want to do about it? Patience.” These words allegedly enraged Davidico, who claimed to have answered: “Yes, Monsignor, if that were enough to satisfy the world, which you have scandalised without cause.” [101] What matters most, however, is that he did not then confine himself to protesting to Morone and venting his rancour to the inquisitor of Perugia in January 1554. Shortly before, in November, immediately after returning to Rome, perhaps on his own initiative but more probably prompted by some authoritative voice, Don Lorenzo thought it advisable to report his suspicions “to the most reverend cardinals of Naples [Carafa], Carpi, and Santa Croce [Cervini],” [102] that is, to the entire high command of the Roman Inquisition. This occurred while, as the next chapter will show, the conflict in the Vatican between Julius III and the Holy Office was reaching breaking point. [103] It is therefore unsurprising that Davidico was welcomed with open arms by those all-powerful inquisitors, who had found accusations of heresy the most effective instrument of their unscrupulous political action. Yet his inability to play the role assigned to him by the Holy Office, his impulsive carelessness, and his lack both of scruple and of intelligence, as we shall see, [104] would ultimately overwhelm him dramatically and drag him to the oar of a galley.

3. “These Priests Are Enemies of Learning”

Some report of the Vercellese priest's journey to Rome, or at least of the gossip he was spreading across half of Italy, probably reached Morone, who also returned to Milan and then Rome in the autumn of 1553. It was certainly no mere coincidence that in January 1554 - just as Davidico was meeting Lachi at Spoleto - Morone sent Novara precise rules on preaching, plainly intending to protect himself and pre-emptively silence anyone, beginning with that fraudulent and vindictive priest but looking well above him as well, who

might wish to spread malicious insinuations about him. The precaution was not useless. In the future, as evidence of his orthodoxy and of the energy with which he had sought to oppose the spread of heretical doctrines in the dioceses entrusted to his government, Morone would attach a copy of this short pastoral instruction to his dossier of defence documents. [105] In reality the author of the text was not the Milanese cardinal, who lacked the preparation to handle delicate theological questions, but Marcello Cervini, who had drafted it around 1549 to combat heterodox preaching in his diocese of Gubbio, especially in the town of Pergola. [106] It is significant, as evidence of the multiple purposes for which these provisions were sent to Novara, with only minor changes from the original, that Morone turned specifically to Cervini, [107] one of the cardinal inquisitors, at precisely the time when Don Lorenzo was meeting him to report his recent experience in Novara and what he claimed to have observed concerning Morone's religious opinions.

Published in the episcopal palace by Vicar Parravicino on 14 February 1554 and addressed to the whole diocese with the “warning that nothing whatsoever is to be omitted,” the short instruction on the “order to be observed in preaching” [108] consisted of fifteen points. They were not very different from the twenty provisions in the *Aviso di quanto si ha da osservare dalli predicatori nella città et diocesi di Modena*, which Morone had published in 1551, shortly after transferring the Emilian diocese to Egidio Foscarari. [109] The detailed norms rested on a primary duty to respect the authority of Scripture and the teaching of the Church, carefully avoiding the danger of insinuating strange and novel doctrines or falling into heresy. Hence the instruction to refrain from idle questions and cloudy disputes, and from publicising heresies even for the purpose of refuting them. Where there was sound reason to suspect that such beliefs were widespread among the faithful, preachers were prudently to guide them back to the right path by positively affirming Catholic doctrine, without needless controversy and above all without allusion or reticence:

> They must not make ambiguous and crafty statements, such that among their hearers one person understands one thing and another something else. [...] Nor are they to treat subjects so briefly and obscurely that their hearers may afterward draw arbitrary interpretations from them in solitary reflections at night or in private conversations. Finally, they must not speak of them subtly and coldly, at the risk of slighting the truths of faith and giving the impression that they wish to undermine them.

These words reveal direct knowledge of the stratagems by which certain preachers used the pulpit to plant maieutic doubts, if not to engage in explicit proselytism, and make clear that the rules were designed above all to prevent or suppress heterodox preaching. This does not appear to have been the case at Novara, where the provisions were sent and disseminated with attention directed chiefly toward Rome and its grim inquisitors. More than anyone else, they were to be informed that Morone was taking effective measures against heretics and preaching the duty of obedience to the Church of Rome, mother and teacher of all the others, pillar and bulwark of truth, and to the pope as its supreme head. From these general premises, the pastoral instruction proceeded to specific questions: original sin; free will; justification - “let them adhere to the doctrine approved by the council”; faith and works - “let them preach [...] openly that faith without works is idle”; predestination - “of which Saint Augustine says that it is sometimes good to keep the truth silent, so as not to scandalise those unable to understand it”; the sacraments, especially confession and the Eucharist, with emphasis on transubstantiation and the real presence of Christ's body in the consecrated host; purgatory; indulgences and the pontiff's right to dispense them as Christ's vicar; relics; saints and their invocation; and sacred images.

It was, in short, a genuine controversialist catalogue of the principal Reformation heresies, which preachers were to take into account in their sermons so as to provide their hearers with the instruments needed to defend themselves against insidious propaganda and to reaffirm the inviolable truths of Catholic teaching. Yet it was also, as noted above, a kind of indirect *professio fidei* by the bishop who issued the provisions, intended to silence anyone bold enough to cast suspicion on his orthodoxy.

This is the most significant document of Morone's pastoral commitment at Novara. The daily government of the diocese was entrusted in the following years to Vicar Parravicino, assisted from August 1553 by Morando as lieutenant and general commissioner, on the eve of the cardinal's final departure. [110] After a short stay in Milan, Morone reached Mantua and left there for Rome on 27 September. [111] Already in April, while

awaiting Davidico's imminent arrival, Parravicino had begun the pastoral visitation of the diocese together with Morone. On 17 May the cardinal wrote to Rome from the Island of Orta that he was “extremely occupied with a visitation and congregation of priests now being held in these valleys, in order to introduce some order according to the needs of this bishopric, [...] bordered by Lutherans on many sides and very disordered.” [112] The vicar resumed the visitation in spring of the following year after the winter interruption, [113] perhaps with the help of “an old man of the Order of Saint Dominic” supported at the bishop's expense, [114] probably Fra Agostino da Vimercate, whom Parravicino appointed vice-inquisitor of the diocese on 22 August 1553. [115]

A year later, on 20 August 1554, Parravicino informed Morone that he had been forced to interrupt the visitation because of the terrible heat and the danger of French incursions in those borderlands. He regretted a letter the bishop had sent him at the beginning of the month, from which he had inferred Morone's “impression that his clergy here are in complete disorder and that I take no measures concerning them.” Though conscious of his many limitations, the vicar sought to persuade Morone that he had always acted according to his orders, with the result that “this clergy of yours, both in the diocese and in the city, by God's grace have never been so disciplined as they are at present, and so continent both as regards concubines and prohibited clothing.” Certainly, there were still young priests who went about “in slashed stockings and doublets,” people who made use of forged papal bulls, and canons who refused to wear the prescribed vestments in church. Others, though appearing “in habit,” behaved like swaggering bullies in the streets and did not hesitate to come to blows, slapping their enemies. [116]

The situation therefore remained very difficult, and the bishop's absence certainly did nothing to improve it, even though Parravicino was “a just and learned man” and tried to do his best. So on 15 September the diligent and devout Somascan from Pavia, Don Vincenzo Gambarana, sought to reassure Morone. [117] The previous year Gambarana had unsuccessfully tried to establish a college at Isola San Giulio for the education of young priests. No one had appeared, as he informed the bishop on 10 December 1553: “The reason is that they become priests to escape the labour of working or in the hope of benefices, and they do not wish to endure the effort of learning, still less to remain here under a rule, being accustomed to wander about and frequent taverns.” He therefore proposed summoning two Jesuits to preach and teach, but also compelling those undisciplined priests to present themselves, on the basis of the Gospel's *Compelle intrare* (Luke 14:23), the biblical foundation of inquisitorial action, and ordering that at the next visitation those “who do not apply themselves to learning and give good hope of themselves should be noted and deprived of all hope of holding office in this diocese.” [118]

Morone's correspondence during these months records his interventions with the grand chancellor of Milan, Count Francesco Taverna of Landriano, to recommend men responsible for even serious crimes at the request of persons whom he greatly wished “to oblige”; [119] to congratulate him on his son's appointment as senator; [120] to seek the release of monks from a Milanese convent imprisoned at Piacenza, assuring Ferrante Gonzaga that they had never intended to meddle in “affairs of state,” but only to defend themselves “from certain wicked friars who plotted against their lives”; [121] to obtain privileges for inhabitants of the Riviera d'Orta; [122] to ask Don Ferrante for the customary exemption of his abbey of San Marziano at Tortona “both from billeting soldiers in transit and from contributions”; [123] and finally, on the eve of his departure, to ask Gonzaga to press the governor of Novara, Giovan Pietro Cicogna, to rebuild the cathedral promptly after it had been demolished to make way for the new fortified walls: “See to it and urge that they do not fail in this, both for the preservation of divine worship, which Your Excellency knows is of great importance to salvation and to the preservation of peaceful and good living, and also for the honour of that city.” [124]

Morone's involvement in the affairs of his native Milan was constant, wherever offices and missions took him. In earlier years too he had not failed to seek favours or appointments, [125] but he also intervened to resolve conflicts between civil and religious power, interpreting in his own fashion the dual role of great Milanese aristocrat and Roman cardinal. On 17 November 1551, for example, he wrote to Taverna concerning yet another jurisdictional conflict between Rome and Milan. It arose from tithes imposed on the clergy to realise Ferrante Gonzaga's great project for strengthening the duchy's military defences, whose

expected proceeds the Milanese treasury attempted to use in part even before they had actually been collected. [126] Morone said that he had “willingly intervened” in the conflict with his practised powers of mediation, in order to reach the agreement he now reported, “to assist both the homeland and the clergy, and to ensure that what was intended should be done in the proper manner and with the authority and licence of the Apostolic See.” By means of specific papal briefs, he obtained cancellation of the condemnations incurred by those involved, beginning with Taverna himself. “Because of the confidence given me by the sincere friendship between us, I ask you in future, in just matters, to show due respect toward the clergy and to guard against matters that could make you incur similar censures or scruples of conscience,” he concluded, urging him never to permit “any hand to be laid upon ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the importance of which you know much better than I.” [127] He also frequently intervened at the imperial court through Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle to recommend candidates for Milanese government offices. [128] He would continue to do so after returning to Rome, supporting the appointment of a Novarese to a senatorial seat, [129] seeking mitigation of a galley sentence for a young man from his diocese “strongly recommended by many great friends of mine,” [130] or introducing someone to Taverna. [131]

It was, in short, an unending succession of problems great and small. This helps explain why on 8 December 1554 Morone wrote to Pole, then in England, asking him to remind Philip II of his diocese's needs and obtain his “release” from it, so as to be freed of “the very great annoyances I continually suffer from that quarter, being afflicted not only by the foreign wars of those regions but also by domestic ones.” [132]

4. Under Investigation in Rome and an Inquisitor in Lombardy

In the articles of defence submitted on 18 August 1559, on the eve of Paul IV's death, Morone included a request that witnesses confirm that during his Novarese episcopate he had not only published instructions on the Catholic manner of preaching and required every parish priest to possess Catholic books necessary for the cure of souls, but had also paid for an inquisitor at his own expense, probably the Agostino da Vimercate mentioned above. [133] Awareness that he was by then under investigation in Rome led the Milanese cardinal to display particular zeal in repressing heresy in his Lombard diocese.

Already at the end of 1552, a few days after entering the city, Morone informed Francesco Taverna of his concern over the spread of heterodox doctrines at Domodossola. Equally determined to combat “this pestilence of heresy,” on 28 December the grand chancellor of Milan immediately forwarded the letter to Ferrante Gonzaga, though he recommended great prudence so as not to endanger good relations with the Swiss. The energetic governor took an entirely different view. In his judgment “the provision should be more vigorous and made in the manner the cardinal desires”; he opposed showing, “in a matter of such importance to the service of God and the public, any consideration for the dissatisfaction of others.” [134] On 5 January 1553 Taverna reported this decision to Morone. On the fourteenth the cardinal thanked him for having done as requested “so that the country may not become infected with Lutheran depravity,” and urged him to write “to the officials of those places around Domodossola, that they should assist and favour the officials of this bishopric of mine both in collecting tithes and other things pertaining to this episcopal estate and in the other spiritual executions that may arise.” In a postscript he asked him to do the same in the Val Sesia, hoping to make “appropriate provision for that disordered clergy without any commotion.” [135] Meanwhile, on 16 January the bishop had an edict published at Domodossola imposing the severest penalties on those who, with grave “prejudice to the holy faith,” smuggled “Lutheran books” or anonymous works from “lands suspected of heresy, especially the Swiss,” and ordering systematic searches at the borders. [136]

The results were slight. On 3 August Morone had to write to the commissioner-general of the Roman Holy Office, Fra Michele Ghislieri, reporting the presence at Vogogna, again in the Val d'Ossola, of the Servite Giovanni Maria known as Gaianino, “who performs many evil services and is deeply stained with heresies.”

He therefore urged Ghislieri to ask the general of the order “to provide a remedy before something worse occurs,” since his appeals to the local superiors “to remove and punish him” had gone unheard. That very day, however, Morone received a letter from the commissioner of the Inquisition in Milan, the

aforementioned Bonaventura Castiglioni, reporting that he had finally been able to question the friar concerning his “condemned assertions” and had concluded that “he will deserve no small punishment.” The following day Ghislieri transmitted to Cervini the information received from Morone about the spread of heresies in the State of Milan, against which “little provision is made, because the Senate wishes to judge ecclesiastical causes just as it does secular ones and gives the inquisitors no help, but rather obstruction.” [137] On 26 August he sent him a copy of the Milanese cardinal's letter, and Cardinal Carpi informed Morone on behalf of his colleagues of their full satisfaction with his conduct. [138] The case was all the more delicate because Gaianino enjoyed powerful protection, including that of Don Ferrante's wife, Isabella Di Capua, who pressed for the Servite to be readmitted to preaching, “since she has been informed by various people and in several ways that henceforth he has no intention of being Saul, but Paul.” At least this was what the Milanese Servites assured Castiglioni, inducing him to intercede with Morone on the friar's behalf. [139]

A little more than a year later, on 20 August 1554, the vicar informed Morone that he had taken measures against the group of heretics infesting Masera in the upper Val d'Ossola, arresting some and summoning others to Milan. [140] This had caused great tension, he explained on 15 September, without concealing that the inquisitors were in manifest danger, because the inhabitants of Masera had allied themselves against God and Jesus Christ. Two suspects had nevertheless been arrested and confined in separate cells, “and men are being sent to seize a schoolmaster who has recently left Masera and is in a valley of Como, [...] a great heretic.” Two weeks later Castiglioni informed Morone that the Senate had legitimised the arrests and that the schoolmaster was still at large, though not for long: “trusting in our Lord God, who will assist me in cutting out this abscess, which is putrefied and stinks.” The Milanese inquisitor now felt himself in the trenches: “Everything possible will be done to provide for the frontiers without neglecting our city, where few weeks pass without someone being caught in foulness before my tribunal - ignorant men, shopkeepers, and the obstinate.” [141]

If dealing with the heretics of the Val d'Ossola fell squarely within a bishop's pastoral duties, Morone also had to confront other inquisitorial emergencies during these years. In May 1551, for example, Ferrante Gonzaga asked him to intervene with the Roman Holy Office on behalf of several canons of Como accused of heresy whom the local inquisitor had hastily arrested. [142] Morone probably did not refuse, since he was still unaware that he too had entered the Holy Office's sights. The situation was different in 1553, when at its meeting of 16 March the congregation of the Holy Office resolved that the pope should seek Morone's collaboration in finding a solution to the heated conflict at Cremona between the *podestà* and the inquisitor. [143] The dispute soon developed into a full jurisdictional confrontation between Milan and Rome over the procedure for trying four members of distinguished families who had been arrested on grave charges of heresy.

On 11 July 1552 the city authorities had sent a representative to Milan to request that the accused be tried by the Senate rather than the Inquisition and to seek their release. They had written repeatedly to the same effect to President Marco Barbavara and Governor Ferrante Gonzaga. [144]

The episode was all the more delicate because the previous year, on 23 January 1551, Ippolito Capilupi had reported to Don Ferrante a conversation with Pope Julius III, from whom he had learned that the cardinal inquisitors had not spared criticism of the governor. In particular, it was a Spaniard, Cardinal Juan Álvarez de Toledo, an authoritative member of the Holy Office, who had stressed “that Your Excellency had also laid hands on the Inquisition at Cremona, which you ought not to have done,” and had complained somewhat about him. Inquisitorial irritation forced Gonzaga to send the pope a “writing” accounting for his conduct in religious matters. Julius III refused even to read it and declared his complete confidence in him. He nevertheless had to acknowledge that “in this business of the Inquisition” there had been “some talk” about Gonzaga, though he guaranteed “that it was not worth a fig, for he would not tolerate anyone speaking of him with less than honour,” convinced that the governor erred “rather on the side of severity in restraining this faction that is insinuating itself through Italy than on the side of indulgence.” [145]

Morone had already been required to concern himself with the heresies proliferating at Cremona in his capacity as cardinal protector of the Humiliati of Milan and Pavia. He succeeded Agostino Trivulzio in that

office in 1548 and retained it until 1560, when Pius IV assigned it to Carlo Borromeo. [146] This occurred in 1550, when, unable to attend the general chapter summoned at Cremona, he asked the bishop of Alba, Girolamo Vida, to represent him and recommended “that in such a chapter proceedings should be conducted according to the sacred canons and the constitutions of the Roman Church, from which he never intended to deviate.” [147] After the chapter Morone also wrote to the new superior general, the Cremonese Giacomo Gadio, directing him “to visit all the houses of that religious order and to see and investigate whether anyone in the said order was stained or suspected of the Lutheran heresies current today, and to conduct an inquiry and determine whether there were prohibited books and books concerning Lutheran opinions.” He asked to be informed of every heterodox deviation, especially among “prelates of authority, whom perhaps you will not be able to correct: make it known to me, and I shall apply all my authority; and when my authority is insufficient, I shall cause the authority of the Holy Inquisition and His Holiness to be applied.” [148] Morone's commitment after the conclave of Julius III to acquiring certificates of orthodoxy that could prove useful in the future is evident.

It is possible that the Cremonese assignment entrusted to him by the Holy Office in 1553 was prompted not only by his Lombard origins, but also by a desire to test his obedience and perhaps catch him at fault: a kind of trap to determine how he would act in yet another conflict between political and religious authority. In those years Milan was governed by a man against whose orthodoxy no suspicion had emerged, and by a ruling class of solid Catholic faith. Yet - as already in matters of benefices and taxation - until that point, in the administration of justice concerning the faith as well, the policy of the Ambrosian government had consisted in limiting the prerogatives

Roman prerogatives. This was due not only to an old municipalist and jurisdictionalist tradition, but also to the mistrust of secular authorities toward the ability of ecclesiastical hierarchies and the inquisitors themselves to strike at heresy, especially when members of the clergy were involved. In earlier years the governor of Milan and the Senate had already ensured that preliminary investigations in matters of faith were initiated by their own officials or by the *podestà*. [149] But as inquisitorial power rapidly strengthened and took root in the provinces as well, the arrest of suspects increasingly triggered disputes between ecclesiastical and secular bodies. Whereas Ferrante Gonzaga had intervened on behalf of the canons of Como cathedral in their conflict with the inquisitor in 1550-52, in the Cremonese case the Senate complained that the local inquisitor had refused the assistance of a lay notary and, following the practice of the Holy Office, had not disclosed the names of the witnesses to the defendants, thereby hampering their defence. [150] In any event, Morone readily seized the opportunity to demonstrate his obedience to the orders received from Rome. Their very assignment to him proved that the supreme inquisitors themselves regarded him as a good Catholic: they would never have entrusted him with action against the Cremonese heretics "if they had held him suspect of heresy," as one of his faithful collaborators would state in 1560. [151]

In the letter signed on 10 April 1553 by all the cardinal inquisitors, they stressed the gravity of the Milanese Senate's assumption of jurisdiction over those trials. The matter had led the pope himself to instruct Morone to deal with it, "knowing how great your zeal for God and for justice has always been." He was therefore urged to protect the rights of the inquisitor, the upright Cremonese Dominican Giovan Battista Chiarino, whose first task was to make the Milanese senators understand "that they neither ought nor are able - except when requested by the inquisitors - to interfere in cases of faith." [152] The cardinal immediately set to work. Early in May he had Chiarino send him the documentation in his possession concerning the Cremonese trials and the disputes arising from them; [153] in June he wished to meet him in person and became increasingly convinced that the affair was rendered "intricate" above all by its political and jurisdictional implications, over which he attempted to mediate. On 17 May, while still engaged in the visitation of Novara, he wrote the cardinal inquisitors an obsequious letter assuring them of his full commitment to restoring "harmony - or, to put it more accurately, the obedience of this Senate to that Holy Office of the Inquisition." [154]

His conspicuous commitment to safeguarding Catholic orthodoxy was appreciated in Rome. On 25 June Ghislieri replied, lamenting the disappearance of "that ancient religious devotion which once existed in some magistrates of our regions," and urging Morone to persuade the Senate "to leave the cases to those who are the competent judges, to support rather than obstruct them, to encourage rather than discourage them." There may have been a touch of irony in his assurance that, "in your shoes, as the proverb has it," there was "greater zeal than in me, and better regulated by your rare and singular prudence." [155] The commissioner-general of the Holy Office also informed him of the discord between the archbishop and the inquisitor of Milan and asked for his help in settling it. In a later letter of 12 July he requested that Morone intervene to defend inquisitorial immunities at Piacenza as well, where "things are going badly, and the evil lies in some great person." [156] He returned to these matters in another letter of 20 July, informing Morone of the "enormous errors" confessed by radical heretics - Anabaptists and antitrinitarians - arrested at Naples and then transferred to Rome; [157] in those same days the Milanese cardinal took care to report several suspicious friars to him. [158] "From letters of the most reverend Cardinal Morone," Ghislieri wrote to Cervini on 4 August, "we learn that heresies are increasing with little remedy, because the Senate wishes to judge ecclesiastical causes just as it does secular ones and gives the inquisitors no assistance, but rather obstruction." [159]

As for Cremona, where "heretical conventicles" had long since given rise to an actual church, the *Ecclesia cremonensis*, [160] Morone's mediation initially seemed successful. On 19 June he wrote to Pier Paolo Arrigoni, president of the Milanese Senate, asking him to appoint two senators with whom the matter could be discussed and conflict with Rome avoided. [161] At the end of July the supreme inquisitors replied to what he had told them on the seventeenth, praising conduct that showed "with how much diligence, zeal, and prudence Your Most Reverend Lordship has acted with that Senate on behalf of the Holy Inquisition, just as

we trusted and expected of you." Yet agreement still seemed far off, and with it the possibility of acting energetically against the spread of heresy throughout the Milanese. [162] In reality the situation remained deadlocked, as appears from a despondent letter Chiarino sent Morone on 12 August. He complained that Rome had left him alone and without instructions, while the Milanese senators seemed unwilling to abandon any of their claims. "It truly grieves me to the soul," he concluded, "to see nothing but nettles multiplying, with no remedy for uprooting them." [163] In those same days the Cremonese friar informed Don Ferrante Gonzaga that he and other Dominicans were being threatened with vengeance "by blood and fire." [164]

For more than a month Morone stayed with his sister at Cusago, outside Milan, where Chiarino joined him to assist in the difficult negotiations. [165] The narrow openings created in the spring by his mediation soon closed, however, as both sides hardened their positions: the Holy Office, increasingly committed to intransigence, and Charles V, in whose eyes the contemporary rampage of the Inquisition in another of his Italian dominions, Naples, plainly confirmed the tribunal's growing encroachment and its ability to bend religious duties to political ends. Don Ferrante himself had warned the emperor that allowing the inquisitors to proceed "in their own way," excluding the Senate, "would amount to nothing other than using the colour of spiritual matters to establish a tribunal embracing a good part of temporal affairs as well, with an authority equal to and perhaps greater than that of Your Majesty." [166] It is therefore unsurprising that the failure of the negotiations left a long trail of controversy on both sides. As late as March 1554, Giovan Battista Schizzi of Cremona, resident representative of the duchy of Milan at the Habsburg court, was seeking an agreement with the papal nuncio in Brussels, Girolamo Muzzarelli, regarding "the disagreement between the most reverend inquisitors and His Majesty's Senate, in accordance with the consultation conducted by the most reverend Monsignor Morone." [167]

The Milanese cardinal was no longer required to intervene personally in the Cremonese jurisdictional disputes or in the trials *in causa fidei* from which they had arisen. [168] After the death of Pope Carafa, however, he would promote a full defensive inquiry at Cremona, where no fewer than twenty witnesses, evidently selected with care, were heard between 8 and 18 January 1560. All testified that at the end of the summer of 1553, during a short stop on his journey from Milan to Rome, the cardinal had delivered "a great reprimand or admonition to certain gentlemen concerning matters of heresy, warning them that they should be good Christians. He marvelled that this city should be stained by such a blemish and therefore exhorted them to hold what the Holy Roman Church holds, and the like." [169] Moreover, since one of the most disturbing centres of heresy had been reported at Fontanella as early as the 1530s, [170] where the lands belonging to his Cremonese commendam were situated, [171] Morone took advantage of a visit to Torre Pallavicina, where his brother-in-law Adalberto Pallavicino resided, to summon the leading inhabitants of that village and issue a second and still sterner admonition. He threatened that unless they themselves denounced the heretics "to the most holy Inquisition and had them given the due punishment they deserved," once he reached Rome he would make "such a report about the men of that place that the pope would make provision for it," and would "have them punished in a way that would serve as an example to all Italy." [172]

He instructed the Servite Placido Fruscati to send "good Catholic" preachers to Fontanella and the neighbouring villages, men who would "preach the Gospel and sound doctrine." He urged him to remain vigilant and report to the Holy Office every heretic of whom they learned, informing Morone himself if necessary; the cardinal was prepared to come expressly "from Rome by post, on the pope's commission, to punish and burn such heretics." [173] Matteo Granelli, a cathedral canon, doctor of both laws, and apostolic protonotary, would testify that he had heard a gentleman of Fontanella say that the place had indeed once been a den of heretics, "but since the most reverend Cardinal Morone passed through these parts, everyone, or at least the greater part, has returned to Christian living and abandoned Lutheran practices." [174]

Much water had flowed under the bridge since, only ten years earlier, the Milanese cardinal, fresh from his encounter with Pole and Flaminio at Trent, had summoned several members of the Modenese Academy and "almost asked their forgiveness for having previously troubled them in matters of faith." [175] Everything had changed in those few years, which had begun with great hopes for the renewal of the Church and religious life and ended in the searing defeat of the conclave that elected Julius III. Charles V's esteem for

Morone had remained unchanged, [176] but after the flight from Innsbruck and the failed reconquest of Metz, the imperial eagle had to abandon forever the hope of restoring German religious unity and begin the bitter course of abdications that would be carried out only a few months later. The pro-Habsburg party in the Sacred College would disintegrate, and the *spirituali* would lose their principal political point of reference.

Morone must have learned with acute anxiety - though nothing of it emerges from his correspondence - of the trials against bishops and archbishops who had followed Ochino and Valdés, and of the violent wave of repression unleashed at Naples in 1552-53. [177] He undoubtedly received news of these events despite his prolonged absence from Rome between the end of 1552 and September of the following year. [178] Nor can there be any doubt that he understood the significance of this inquisitorial turn. On 15 July 1553, writing from Milan to Beccadelli about his Cremonese mission, he informed him that he had "on my hands the same sort of case that Your Lordship recently had with the Venetian lords concerning the manner of proceeding against heretics. God help us!" [179] In short, in the hope of avoiding formal investigation in Rome as a Lutheran heretic, Morone had to strive in Lombardy to look as much as possible like a grim inquisitor.

Chapter Twelve

A Pontiff “Continually Irritated against the Office of the Holy Inquisition”

1. Julius III and the Holy Office

The clash that had taken place in the conclave of 1549-50 had made public the accusations of heresy against Pole that had long been circulating. [1] Carafa's intervention had been a genuine declaration of war, foreshadowing feverish inquisitorial activism. Yet the meagre minutes of the congregation's meetings, preserved from 24 October 1548 onward, do not allow its work to be followed: partly because they are confined to stenographic records of decisions, and above all because they omit the most important matters, evidently settled informally or recorded separately. The names of well-known figures in the history of Italian religious dissent appear in them, but no member of the so-called *Ecclesia viterbiensis*. Flaminio, however, had been on the list of suspects since 1542, while Carnesecchi had been summoned to Rome in 1546 to face a trial from which only the intervention of Pole and the Medici duke had saved him. To curb the power of the Holy Office, on that occasion Paul III had thrown the full weight of his authority into the balance through an informal procedure, “without written registers or anything else and without the participation of notaries or other officials,” so as to prevent the inquisitors from obtaining testimony that might prove embarrassing. [2] As early as 1543, moreover, the pope had blocked the inquiry requested by the Jesuits into Morone's expulsion of Alfonso Salmerón from Modena; [3] and in April 1545, no doubt to the great chagrin of the Holy Office, he had even granted Morone's request that the parish priests of Modena be permitted “to absolve in confession those who have incurred excommunication for having read Lutheran and heretical books and for any other heresy.” [4]

The prosecution of the Florentine protonotary had been prompted by his hospitality in his Venetian house to a Florentine priest who translated Celio Secondo Curione's *Pasquino in ecstasy* into Italian there. [5] This apparently had nothing to do with Pole, although the English cardinal was undoubtedly the Theatine's principal target, and Carafa must therefore have regarded Pope Farnese's intervention as a defeat. It is plausible - though the silence of the sources must halt us here - that the Holy Office had planted spies and informers in the opposing camp: the Englishman Thomas Goldwell, for example, “custodian” in Pole's household who later became a Theatine at Naples in 1547; [6] or the Spaniard Juan Ramírez, who in 1546 denounced Carnesecchi while staying as his guest in Venice, Carnesecchi being unaware of his role as “a spy who practised that trade for a living.” [7] On 3 July 1554 Augusto Cocciano reported from Rome to Seripando that the inquisitors had made “a great uproar” with the pope because a guard of Castel Sant'Angelo had wounded a Neapolitan “who was their spy.” [8] In some cases the informers were heretics who had submitted to abjuration and become collaborators of the Holy Office, such as Giovan Battista Scotti at Bologna or the Neapolitan Ranieri Gualano, who lived for some time in Pole's household and had previously said that the cardinal had “enlightened him, because he had come to know Christ through justification explained in their manner, that is, the Lutheran manner.” Arrested and tried at Rome in 1551, he abjured on 11 March of the following year. [9]

It is likely, however, that the information supplied by such men was entrusted only to Carafa's memory and private archive. In the recent conclave he had in fact been forced to draw on the full weight of his authority to lend credibility to the accusations against the English cardinal. The institutional machinery was fluid: it lacked efficient structures, tested and uniform procedures, and stable forms of connection between centre and periphery, and was dominated by the overpowering personality of its founder. This did not prevent it from acting with vigorous dynamism, as shown by the fact that in 1548 alone the Roman congregation dealt with ninety-two cases. [10] Yet these records contain no trace of the investigations closest to the Theatine's heart, evidently conducted informally to preserve their secrecy. In the early years, moreover, the supreme inquisitors included figures such as Tommaso Badia and Gregorio Cortese, both very close to Contarini and certainly unwilling to follow Carafa's line without protest. Paul III had doubtless appointed

them precisely to supervise his action and temper his authoritarian severity. For his part, the Theatine was probably unwilling to engage with views different from his own at the summit of the Holy Office, where from the beginning he exercised an undisputed leadership. This was perhaps why he acted in an extra-institutional sphere, entirely private and personal, which left no trace in the official documentation.

The first to move, however, was not the impetuous Neapolitan cardinal but Julius III. He had witnessed the decisive role assumed by the Holy Office in the papal election - if only as a power of exclusion - by setting itself up as guarantor of a non-negotiable doctrinal orthodoxy and thereby placing a heavy mortgage on the new pope's political and religious choices. For this reason too he immediately planned a reform of the conclave, though without result, and above all intervened in matters strictly within inquisitorial competence, partly to make clear that he, and no one else, wore the tiara. On 27 February 1550 he established a cardinalatial commission *de rebus fidei*, composed of the dean, De Cupis, and the inquisitors Carafa, Cervini, and Sfondrati, but also Crescenzi, Morone, and Pole. This at least partly marginalised the congregation, which claimed an absolute monopoly over questions of faith and must therefore have regarded discussion within the commission of how to extirpate heresy as an invasion of its territory. [11] In September Pole and Morone were also appointed to the "consultation on the bull to be sent concerning the affairs of the council in Germany," in preparation for the reconvocation of the Tridentine assembly on 14 November. [12] In that same month, finally, the Milanese cardinal joined Pole, Crescenzi, and Cervini on a commission charged with reforming the Sapienza. [13] A consummate politician and acute student of the German world, he could hardly fail to play a leading role at the moment when the pope was reconvening the council and seeking an agreement with Charles V, whose grave difficulties in Germany forced him to moderate his conflict with the Holy See and settle the tangled question of Parma.

A clear indication of the new pope's strategy against heresy was provided by the two decrees *Cum meditatio cordis* and *Illius qui misericors*, issued on 29 April 1550. Taking the jubilee as their occasion, they constituted a genuine edict of grace valid for two months. The first allowed confessors to absolve *in utroque foro* penitents who had read or possessed heterodox books; the second permitted those who voluntarily presented themselves to the inquisitors and disclosed their heretical past to abjure in secret, while granting them another month in which to name their accomplices. [14] The supreme Roman tribunal detested these decrees, under which crowds of heretics might escape cheaply, and worked to limit the damage. It succeeded in requiring written registration of the abjurations, thereby creating a valuable archive that would also make it possible to reopen those hasty absolutions in the future. The delays with which curial officials published the briefs may well have resulted from inquisitorial obstruction: they reached Venice, for example, only on 28 July and Modena on 10 August. [15] Hostilities between Julius III and the Holy Office thus began immediately. This is also suggested by the bull of 6 May 1551, in which the pope authorised the Jesuits "to absolve cases pertaining to heresy *in foro conscientiae*" in order "to console many souls," greatly extending the privilege granted by Paul III in 1545, whose application had been limited to *in partibus infidelium*. [16]

The reasons that led Pope Farnese and then Pope Del Monte to adopt such a measure in favour of a recently founded religious order viewed with hostility by the Holy Office remain largely obscure; as usual, the early Jesuit sources are reticent on the matter. The order's approval had been reaffirmed by the bull *Exposcit debitum* of 21 July 1550, supported by Pole [17] and especially by Morone, who expressed his satisfaction to Loyola on 12 March 1550 by referring to "our Society." [18] The initiative probably sprang from the desire not to entrust jurisdiction over heresy solely to the Roman inquisitors and to employ for this purpose foreign clerics who professed themselves "most papist," [19] detached both from the mendicant orders and from the networks of power and solidarity among the peninsula's urban elites, but eager to win the favour of the curial leaders, whom Polanco called the chief human pillar of the Society. [20] There is no doubt that Carafa opposed these measures. Once elected pope he would abolish them, while Pius IV would later restore them. [21] In those years the Society fought heresy not through the judicial instruments of trial and repression but through the pastoral means of persuasion, confession, and penance, offering a way back into the Catholic fold with "gentleness and loving-kindness." So the Jesuit Cristoforo Rodríguez would write in describing what he considered the best method for dealing with the persistent Waldensian communities in

Apulia and Calabria. [22] Julius III had known and appreciated Laínez and Salmerón during the conciliar legation at Bologna. In the spring of 1551, when the council resumed, he appointed them his trusted theologians “with the intention that, should the leaders of the Lutherans come, they would answer them.” [23]

As was predictable, the Holy Office did not fail to react, launching an all-out battle to impose its supremacy. Its first targets were the Valdesians of Naples, Pole and Morone with their friends and collaborators, and bishops connected with them in various ways whose prospects of the cardinalate threatened to contaminate the Sacred College even further than it already was. For the moment, by contrast, the attempt to resist the spread of heresy in Italian cities was less decisive, except at Naples and in the places where Pietro Manelfi's denunciation in October 1551 uncovered a dense Anabaptist network whose social and political radicalism prompted active cooperation from the civil authorities. [24] This occurred especially at Venice and Florence, where the simultaneous prosecution of Ludovico Domenichi for the clandestine edition of Calvin's *Nicodemiana* brought the investigation close to the Medici court itself. [25] In Venice the suspicions of the Roman inquisitors extended even to the man who should have been their *longa manus*: the nuncio Ludovico Beccadelli, Contarini's former secretary, connected with the world of the *spirituali*, who had been appointed to the office on 11 March 1550. [26] The appointment was certainly unwelcome to the Holy Office, which soon informed him that it considered his conduct too weak and compliant. Nor can the inquisitors have welcomed the brief of 18 April 1550 in which Julius III reaffirmed Beccadelli's power to prosecute heretics all the way to a capital sentence. [27] They can readily be identified with the “four most reverend cardinals, among the oldest and gravest,” who during a consistory made “a great complaint” to the pope about the spread of heresy in Venetian territory and “the little care devoted to it,” demanding “some forceful remedy.” [28]

Despite those complaints, the widespread proliferation of heresy from below was not the central concern of the Roman congregation. Vigorous inquisitorial activism nevertheless soon made visible the change occurring at the summit of the Church, as Vergerio, now an exile in the Grisons, immediately perceived. The hunt for evangelicals in Italy was growing ever more intense, he wrote in early May 1551, when the trial of Soranzo showed that not even an episcopal mitre could shield its wearer from the thunderbolts of the Holy Office. [29] It was then, after a decade of underground action, that the blade of repression began to fall where heresy was most dangerous: at the heights of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and in Valdesian Naples. In Modena and Lucca, as in Mantua and Ferrara, Bergamo and Brescia, Cremona and Bologna, it was still possible to wait for the moment, recalling only the most significant cases to Rome and attempting to contain heterodox preaching, which in increasingly skilful forms carried the poison of heresy from city to city.

Between 1548 and 1559 the Roman Holy Office concerned itself with more than a hundred preachers throughout Italy: Capuchins, Dominicans, Lateran Canons Regular, and Augustinians, often protected by the leaders of their orders and sometimes by more or less explicit complicities. [30] For this reason, on 20 May 1550 it issued a decree requiring all preachers to denounce Lutheran heresies. This was reinforced by another decree of 29 December urging the pope to order the generals of every order not to allow friars to preach or hear confessions without their own licence or that of the provincial fathers. [31] It was harder to act within individual urban settings, with their networks of collusion interwoven with social hierarchies, their magistracies reluctant to submit to external authority, and the resulting jurisdictional conflicts. Among the first to perceive this was Fra Michele Ghislieri, the future Pius V, during the missions that took him in 1550-51 to Como, the Valtellina, and Bergamo. There he moved skilfully and at times unscrupulously through the web of local conflict, without hesitating to override episcopal powers, forge alliances with groups and factions, and claim the right to violate established rules and customs in the name of the overriding need to safeguard the faith - a principle that made anyone who failed to cooperate promptly *ipso facto* suspect of complicity. [32] It was valuable experience for his future, and proof to the supreme tribunal of his uncommon ability. In June 1551 he was summoned to Rome to succeed Scullica as commissioner-general of the Holy Office.

In the first phase, alongside the effort to contain heterodox preaching, the chief concern was to strengthen the central institution by enlarging its powers and resources. Confirmation comes from a short paper of

Memoranda for His Holiness, anonymous and undated but attributable to the pontificate of Julius III. Its author called for urgent measures concerning the Inquisition, beginning with the revocation of every licence "to read Lutheran books or books suspected of heresy." [33] His principal concern, however, was the power to proceed against secular princes and prelates as well, to prevent "the ruin of the Holy Church from following one day." In words that could hardly have stated its primary objectives more plainly, the Holy Office informed the pope that it possessed "evidence against certain great prelates which opens the way to discovering the truth for anyone willing to use due diligence." Other requests followed, many of them destined to be realised during the pontificate of Paul IV: application at Ancona and Rome of anti-Jewish regulations; jurisdiction for the Holy Office over blasphemers and sodomites; the grant of "immunities, privileges, indulgences, and exemptions from duties to the house of the Holy Inquisition and, if it please him, also to its ministers"; recognition of its "officials" as members of the papal court "not inferior to the others"; sufficient funding to enable the tribunal to operate "without burdening offenders in their temporal goods"; the requirement that the congregation's opinion be heard when assigning the benefices of persons under investigation; and finally a claim to full jurisdictional autonomy, accompanied by appropriate admonitions to "princes and temporal lords that they allow ecclesiastical inquisitors appointed by this Holy See to exercise the office freely and do not interfere in it except when requested by the said inquisitors, and that they give them the secular arm and their support."

This accumulation of demands helps explain why the peripheral tribunals of the Holy Office initially experienced a "slow take-off," a "gradual and varied beginning," [34] and why the repression of heretical groups could rely only on the weak forces of local inquisitors, often unequal to their tasks. Morone would later recall that in the 1540s "many places were without an Inquisition, and in many the inquisitors were men of little ability." [35] A major city rich in heterodox ferment such as Bologna, for example, did not receive an inquisitor appointed from Rome until the end of the decade. [36] There was no tribunal at Naples, hostile to anything that might evoke the Spanish Inquisition, although the first systematic repression took place precisely in that city. [37] From the outset, as we have seen, the supreme tribunal of the faith had aimed to combat the most dangerous enemies: "ecclesiastical prelates" suspected of heresy, or even merely advocates of pastoral solutions founded on gentleness, persuasion, and patience.

It is therefore unsurprising that Valdesians and *spirituali* stood at the top of the list of those whom the Holy Office regarded as its worst enemies and hence the first to be fought. Among the bishops investigated in the 1540s the *Decreta* mention Pier Paolo Vergerio of Capodistria, Iacopo Nacchianti of Chioggia, and Giovan Francesco Verdura of Messina, [38] all involved in the theology of the *Beneficio di Cristo*, though marginal beside the world of the *spirituali*, whose most authoritative figures were Pole and Morone. Others must be added: Andrea Centani, bishop of Limassol on Cyprus, and Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, bishop of Cava dei Tirreni, formerly a commissioner of the council and protagonist of a notorious clash at Trent with the bishop known as Grechetto, with whom he came to blows after expressing his views on the doctrine of justification. At the time it was the papal legates who restrained Sanfelice's excesses and reprimanded bishops such as Braccio Martelli, Nacchianti, and Soranzo for taking positions contrary to Roman directives. The Holy Office did not intervene directly in the assembly's work, although it certainly conditioned its outcome. [39]

The inquiry into Vergerio, begun in the mid-1540s, arose from the reactions provoked by his reforms in the diocese of Capodistria, which increasingly revealed the doctrinal premises that sustained them. Despite the many protections he enjoyed, in 1549 he was forced to take refuge in the Grisons, where he conducted a tireless pamphlet campaign against the popes of Rome. The inquiry into Nacchianti - the Florentine Dominican whom Paul III's favour had raised to the see of Chioggia in 1544 and who was already suspect because of the positions he had taken at Trent in 1546 - rested on the cathedral canons' opposition to his campaign against clerical abuses and superstitious forms of popular devotion. The ensuing trial arose from a local denunciation and saw a leading role played by Marcello Cervini. His membership of the congregation gave him authority, but he acted outside all institutional procedure, as shown by the fact that the first investigation of Nacchianti was entrusted in 1549 to Angelo Massarelli, who had no connection with the

Holy Office and acted solely as his patron's confidant. [40] Summoned to Rome, where according to Vergerio he was left for many months “to suffer and burst,” [41] Nacchianti was finally allowed to return to Chioggia only through papal pardon. The Holy Office was enraged and openly vented its furious indignation against Julius III, accusing him of releasing the bishop “with a blessing” in deference to Venetian pressure, and still more of allowing him to resume the government of his diocese. [42]

2. “Into the Bosom of His Clemency”: The Expedient of Canonical Purgations

The battle against members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy contaminated by heretical poison, and particularly against the *spirituali*, thus guided inquisitorial action, to which Julius III offered a feeble and intermittent resistance. For this purpose in the early 1550s he frequently resorted to canonical purgation, a kind of private confession into the pope's hands that enabled him to breach inquisitorial jurisdiction, recall the case to himself, and resolve it through an unappealable absolution. Several high-ranking figures were involved, men whose prestige, family tradition, and political connections seemed likely to transform the episcopal mitre into a cardinal's hat. Vittore Soranzo is one example. Bishop of Bergamo from 1544, he had worked with great vigour and equal imprudence to spread the theology of the *Beneficio di Cristo* among clergy and laity, as we have seen. [43] Early suspicions arose, and in July 1550 they led the Holy Office to open an inquisitorial inquiry that culminated in his summons to Rome the following year.

The pressure exerted on the pope by the Venetian ambassador Matteo Dandolo proved useless. Julius had to retract his promise to hear the bishop privately and “keep him with me for two hours in discussion, in such a way that we shall get to the bottom of him,” thereby removing him from the Holy Office. Instead, on 24 March 1551 Soranzo had to appear before the plenary congregation *coram pontifice* to be informed of “the terrible trial concerning many accusations against him.” The inquisitors had descended on the pope over his rash interventions and forced him to consent to the accused man's arrest, threatening to resign unless normal procedure was followed. In reply to Dandolo's indignant protests, Julius III had to admit that he had been compelled to yield: [44]

> I could do no less, because these cardinals have been on top of me, especially the Theatine, so much so that I had to say to them: “It seems to me that you wish to try me, and not the bishop of Bergamo.” They, for their part, cry to heaven that with a blessing I allowed the bishop of Chioggia [Iacopo Nacchianti] to go away. That too was at your urging, and now he is there doing worse than ever, for they are well informed about him. But I shall send word to them once and for all that by the end of tomorrow they must have examined and formally questioned him; do not doubt that we shall have him dispatched quickly.

From the outset, therefore, the conflict between the pope and the Holy Office emerged as the background to the entire trial and to the broader offensive against the *spirituali* of which it formed part. The Este ambassador in Rome understood this. On 31 March, with a shrewd sense of what was happening, he recorded rumours that Soranzo had “accomplices of considerable importance.” [45] “Continually irritated against the office of the Holy Inquisition,” which claimed the right to accuse eminent prelates - as it had done during the conclave - without even deigning to inform him, and increasingly convinced that “only through malice and envy of the papacy did the said office persecute Pole and Morone,” Julius III attempted to regain control of the tribunal. He therefore entrusted a man in whom he had absolute confidence, the Bolognese Dominican Girolamo Muzzarelli, master of the Sacred Palace and consultor of the congregation, with supervising every investigation concerning bishops or cardinals and reporting it to the pope. An excellent scholar of the sacred languages and an eminent theologian who had taken part in the council during its Bolognese phase, Muzzarelli had been prior of the convent of San Domenico and an inquisitor. [46] In that capacity he had enjoyed cordial relations with Morone and won the esteem of Legate Del Monte, who after his papal election brought him to Rome in the prestigious office of official theologian of the Holy See. Determined to recover jurisdiction over the Church's leaders, Julius III instructed him to communicate to the inquisitors a prohibition against “receiving any deposition in the Holy Office against cardinals or other superior prelates, that is, bishops and cardinals, without first informing His Holiness.” [47]

Through Cardinal Giacomo Puteo the pope issued a similar order - “that under pain of His Holiness's displeasure I should never dare to ask questions about cardinals” [48] - to another tribunal official, Girolamo Federici. He too served as the pope's *longa manus* in the inquisitorial congregation and became increasingly convinced that the suspicions of heresy surrounding Morone arose above all because the cardinal was emerging as an ever more credible candidate for the tiara. Julius III shared this belief. Muzzarelli repeatedly told him that “Pole and Morone were two great and virtuous men, but [...] the papacy did them harm.” [49] In addition to informing the pope of the progress of trials and providing summaries, Muzzarelli and Federici probably also took care to supply him privately with material useful in countering Carafa's actions. Such material included several of Ghislieri's letters concerning the Soranzo case, which the pope did not hesitate to show to the Venetian ambassador. [50]

As we shall see, this was not the only time Federici played a crucial role beside the master of the Sacred Palace in papal strategy. [51] A Lombard like Morone - he had been born at Treviglio in 1516 - Federici had enjoyed a brilliant Roman career after taking his doctorate in both laws. From 1540 he served as lieutenant to the auditor-general of the Apostolic Camera, Giambattista Cicala. [52] Cicala's elevation to the cardinalate in December 1551 helped Federici obtain appointment the following year as bishop of Sagone in Corsica, succeeding his maternal uncle. Highly esteemed by Julius III, he was confirmed by the pope as legal assessor of the Holy Office, [53] and then appointed vice-legate of the Patrimony of Saint Peter in 1553 and governor of Rome in 1555. Paul IV removed him from the latter office immediately after his election. Federici regained it in 1560 at the will of Pius IV, who placed him alongside Alessandro Pallantieri in directing the trial of Pope Carafa's nephews and in 1562 transferred him to the diocese of Martorano. [54]

It is therefore unsurprising that the Theatine cardinal cordially detested this papal watchdog set upon his heels, a man whom Onofrio Panvinio described as energetic, determined, and capable, [55] or that Michele Ghislieri resented his presence at the interrogation of prisoners, especially when revelations about illustrious prelates were expected. Yet Federici was not inclined to regard heresy indulgently. In September 1568 Carlo Borromeo would praise his “particular inclination, great zeal, intelligence, and experience” in extirpating it, having recently observed his efficiency and severity during a mission to Mantua to suppress the religious dissent that had taken root at the Gonzaga court. The Carafian party's fierce hostility toward him is confirmed by the fact that Borromeo himself sheltered Federici at Milan soon after the election of Pius V in order to protect him from his many enemies. Later, Gregory XIII, a pope little loved by the Holy Office, sent him as nuncio to Savoy in 1573 and finally appointed him bishop of Lodi in 1576, where he died three years later. [56]

Only against the political and religious conflicts then raging in the curial palaces can the course and outcome of Soranzo's trial be understood. He was never questioned about Pole or Morone, nor - in order to avoid implicating them - about the many Valdesians and *spirituali* with whom he had formerly maintained close relations: Colonna, Flaminio, Priuli, Carnesecchi, Di Capua, Giannetti, Merenda, and Rullo. [57] The inquiry was entirely and exclusively Bergamasque, concerned with the bishop's pastoral conduct and local complicities, without ever approaching the issues that may readily be presumed to have mattered most to the inquisitors. Soranzo tried in vain to convince his judges that “His Holiness's intention is that through Your Lordships he should learn the truth of the matters from me, not by way of an examination.” In this way he sought to escape a trial and present his journey to Rome as a voluntary appearance intended to clarify misunderstandings and silence malicious rumours. Aware that the situation was deteriorating, but not yet that he had been cornered, he deluded himself that a profession of repentance and a promise of greater caution in future might still allow him to bypass the tribunal and be received by the pope “into the bosom of his clemency.” [58]

In June 1551, however, in a direct confrontation with the pope, the Holy Office drew upon the overwhelming documentation in its possession to open the formal phase of the trial. This was exactly what Julius III wished to avoid, not merely or chiefly to please the Venetian Republic, but to curb the congregation's excessive power and make Carafa and his followers understand that the pope was still, in the last resort, himself, and that the final word therefore belonged to him, especially when bishops and cardinals were involved. After a final private interview with Julius III, who must have explained the true terms of the

matter, Soranzo at last decided to submit a new *confessio* on 28 June 1551, admitting every heresy of which he had been accused. [59] Then came the most difficult step, the bitterest morsel to swallow: he was asked to list his accomplices and friends without reticence as proof of repentance and willingness to cooperate in safeguarding the faith and souls. He could not refuse this duty, but confined himself to names already mentioned in the interrogations: the collaborators with whom he had surrounded himself and the heterodox friars to whom he had entrusted prohibited books and preaching assignments. He never mentioned Morone, Pole, or the other members of the *Ecclesia viterbiensis*.

Thus, although the Venetian bishop was forced to succumb beneath the weight of the charges, the leaders of the Holy Office had to bow to the papal will and accept that illustrious prelates would not be drawn into the inquiry. It was precisely for this purpose that Julius III had entrusted the interrogations to his own confidants and excluded the person who more than anyone else had the right to participate and dominate them: the commissioner-general of the Holy Office, Teofilo Scullica. On 8 April the Venetian ambassador reported to the Council of Ten [60] the pope's agreement with his suggestion that they should

> shorten Fra Teofilo's hands, because he employs them with excessive severity, immediately having this man and that man imprisoned without the least Christian charity, which requires that they first be corrected fraternally, with gentleness, tears, and compassion, and only then proceed to these acts, in which he rejoices and triumphs and laughs as they are carried out, as though he had offered a sacrifice to God.

Soranzo's trial dragged on throughout the summer of 1551 in a steady drip of increasingly grave admissions by the bishop concerning the heresies he had professed. On 3 July he was finally forced to confess that he had "believed and held with Martin [...] in the Lutheran manner." Yet another two months were required to resolve the silent conflict between Julius III and the Holy Office: the pope was determined to prevent a public condemnation that would indirectly implicate Pole and Morone, while the tribunal sought precisely that result. In the end, though only through a compromise, Julius III prevailed on this occasion. On 9 September, in the presence of Cardinals Carafa, Álvarez de Toledo, and Verallo, the master of the Sacred Palace, the congregation's lieutenant Gaspare Dotti, and Commissioner Michele Ghislieri, the "unworthy" bishop of Bergamo, humbly contrite and kneeling before God and the pope, abjured the heresies of which he had been guilty. On the basis of the trial record the pope formally declared him guilty of the heresies he had abjured, but at the same time, in consideration of his repentance, absolved him from excommunication and the other canonical penalties he had incurred. In short, although a confessed heretic - and at that very time described in one of Vergerio's pamphlets as reputed "not to be too good a papalist" [61] - through Julius III's intervention *vivae vocis oraculo*, Soranzo received a mild sentence and, above all, retained his episcopal title, though for the moment he was suspended from governing the diocese.

Less bitter, but destined to continue until the conclusion of the Council of Trent and beyond, was the affair of another Venetian patrician, Giovanni Grimani. He held the patriarchate of Aquileia, which for nearly half a century had been treated as a kind of family possession, passed among relatives together with other dioceses and abbeys in Venetian territory: from Cardinal Domenico Grimani to his nephews Marco and Marino, and then, after Marino's death in 1546, to their brother Giovanni, who appeared destined to inherit the purple as well. [62] A cultivated and refined man, friend and correspondent of Carnesecchi, Grimani had approached the theology of the *Beneficio di Cristo* in the 1540s and associated with suspicious figures. His attitudes provoked the venomous accusations of Bishop Grechetto in 1546-47. Grechetto called him "very perverse" and warned that if he received the red hat "many will become Lutherans, thinking that by this road they may become cardinals, because he is most Lutheran and has always favoured Lutherans inside and outside his house." [63] For the moment these charges had no consequences in Rome. In later years, however, further reports reached the city that he was "little friend to Catholic truth," a great admirer of Ochino, and hostile to devotional practices he regarded as superstitious. In his case too the Holy Office acted immediately after the election of Julius III to prevent at the outset any design to confer the purple upon him. Yet his substantial lack of interest in the pastoral problems of his diocese suggests that his religious outlook arose less from mature theological choices than from a willingness to absorb doctrines, concepts, and language then widely circulating, without fully appreciating their explosive rupture with orthodoxy.

The inquisitorial investigation of his physician and household member Giambattista Susio in 1550, followed by the opening of Soranzo's trial the next year, must have sounded an alarm for the patriarch of Aquileia. Toward the end of 1551 or early in 1552, under the pretext of settling his brother's outstanding inheritance affairs, he travelled personally to Rome to clear himself of the insidious accusations directed against him. It is significant that once again the pope entrusted the questioning to Muzzarelli and Federici, his trusted agents whenever an obstacle had to be placed in the Holy Office's path, instructing them to report to him in person. [64] In a lengthy memorial written ten years later, the patriarch would explain that he had decided to submit to canonical purgation only because the pope had assured him that he would emerge “purer and more spotless than before,” thereby silencing his enemies “for all time to come.” At the pope's urging, the Venetian ambassador also encouraged him to take this step, which would render him “more suitable and more capable of receiving the cardinalate,” to which he would be appointed at the next consistory. [65] Persuaded by this pressure, Grimani finally underwent the procedure on 28 February 1553, solemnly swearing before Julius III that he had never held heterodox opinions, while the pope swore in turn that he believed him. In reality, although Grimani deluded himself that every difficulty had been overcome, the red hat would always remain a mirage, which for more than twenty years he continued to pursue through a constant alternation of hopes and disappointments. As for Julius III, increasingly furious at the Holy Office's intolerable encroachments but unable to move beyond containment and mediation, he would have had no difficulty yielding to repeated Venetian pressure to confer the purple on this nephew and brother of cardinals. But he lacked the courage and strength to overcome the inquisitors' veto.

The similar case of Pietro Antonio Di Capua also began in 1551. Charles V insistently pressed for his elevation to the cardinalate, while the inquisitors opposed it and would ultimately prevail despite Julius III, not least because they possessed overwhelming evidence against him. A descendant of a great Neapolitan family linked by marriage to the Habsburg plenipotentiary in Italy, Don Ferrante Gonzaga, Di Capua had been appointed archbishop of Otranto in 1536 at the age of only twenty-three. He was among Juan de Valdés's first Neapolitan disciples and was present at his death in July 1541. [66] Regarded in the mid-1540s as one of the leaders of that “sect,” [67] he was closely attached to Giulia Gonzaga, Mario Galeota, and Pietro Carnesecchi, whom he also met in Venice in 1543, recalling the Spanish exile's teaching in a kind of contest over who “admired and praised his writings more.” [68] The positions Di Capua had taken at Trent during the first, abortive convocation of 1542-43, when he became close to Cristoforo Madruzzo and Giovanni Morone, both pillars of the imperial party, and his favour toward a preacher reputed heretical such as Andrea Ghetti da Volterra, aroused the first suspicions against him. At Rome he formed friendships with the group gathered around Pole, for whom he had “great reverence,” [69] and opened his residence to men variously contaminated by heresy, among whom he chose the preachers sent to his Salentine diocese. Grechetto had already denounced him in February 1546 as a leading figure of the group sprung from Giberti's “evil seed.” [70] Although protected by his social rank, Di Capua soon became the object of inquisitorial investigations, attested among other things by a lost dossier dated 1548. [71]

His case - political no less than religious - erupted dramatically in the autumn of 1551, when imperial pressure for the elevation to the cardinalate of this cultivated prelate of exemplary life - even the best man and best Christian in Italy, according to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza - encountered the iron opposition of the Holy Office. [72] Julius III tried to persuade Charles V to withdraw his request, pointing out that Di Capua had “for some time been marked in the inquisitors' books, from the period when many learned men who held Lutheran doctrine gathered at Viterbo.” So Ferrante Gonzaga wrote on 20 October 1551, explicitly referring to “the school whose principal leader was the cardinal of England, whom Your Majesty held in such high esteem that not long ago you judged it your duty to help him to the supreme pontificate.” [73] Unwilling to appear a protector of heretics, Charles V dug in and made the matter a question of principle, inaugurating a long trial of strength with Julius III, who was reluctantly forced to defend the claims of the Holy Office. He then temporised, changed his mind, and contradicted himself in a continual oscillation between aspirations and inability to prevail over the ever more invasive power of the tribunal.

The archbishop of Otranto immediately came to Rome in mid-November 1551 “to clear himself of the charges” and request that “his case be examined and dispatched with all speed through sheer justice and in no other way,” as Ercole Gonzaga wrote to the court in Brussels. Don Diego de Mendoza stressed that this rush to Rome meant only that Di Capua cared more about freeing himself from the accusations than obtaining the red hat. He maintained that the archbishop's only alleged fault was his friendship with Pole, Morone, Flaminio, and Carnesecchi. [74] In fact, the Holy Office possessed a substantial body of evidence against Di Capua, especially - as Federici would recall in 1560 - “on the article of justification.” [75] The archbishop therefore found himself compelled to choose between a full formal trial and canonical purgation. In the preceding months the latter solution had enabled Julius III to rescue other prelates from the inquisitorial claws, but it also entailed an indelible stain that would force a man to live the rest of his life “neither honoured nor content within himself in the sight of the world,” as the cardinal of Mantua explained to Mendoza on 27 November. Di Capua's wish to be proclaimed innocent clashed with the Holy Office's determination to try him, while Julius III was once again required to mediate between the claims of orthodoxy, over which the supreme tribunal of the faith set itself up as the ultimate guardian, and the claims of politics, which urged him to satisfy Charles V's requests, especially at a moment when the council's resumption sanctioned a renewed spirit of cooperation between Empire and papacy.

In the spring of 1552 Julius III assigned the familiar Muzzarelli and Federici to follow the trial. Di Capua was as pleased as the inquisitors were irritated; they protested at the pope's decision to take “this case out of their hands.” [76] In reality the two papal confidants could accomplish little, not least because the dossier continued to swell with new depositions. [77] The struggle dragged on for months before Julius III finally prevailed, once again interposing his authority between Carafa and Di Capua. At the congregation of 16 March 1553, doubtless after agreeing the manoeuvre with the pope, Cardinal Puteo distributed a “detailed report” on the case to his colleagues and concluded that “the oath of the said archbishop” had to be believed more than all the witnesses who had testified against him. The pope ruled accordingly. Álvarez de Toledo reacted furiously and tried in every way to oppose the decision, declaring “that there were other things against the archbishop that were not in the proceedings,” as Capilupi reported to Mantua three days later. His words revealed that the hard core of the Holy Office reserved the right to conceal part of the documentation in its possession from both the pope and the rest of the congregation. Rising to his feet in a state of “agitation,” the Spanish cardinal shouted bluntly “that cases were not dispatched in the way this one was being dispatched, and that they had to be considered very carefully.” This time Pope Del Monte refused to be intimidated and would not allow the Holy Office's “manner” to override papal authority. He sharply rebuked the insulting conduct: “Sit down, Monsignor,” he replied to his face, “and do not become angry. State your opinion; we shall then give judgment.” [78]

Di Capua too was therefore able to escape by pronouncing a canonical purgation on 26 March, similar to Grimani's and thus placing a tombstone over every ambition to the purple. Kneeling in the presence of Cardinals Puteo and Pacheco, Muzzarelli, and four Neapolitan bishops who swore that they had formerly known him *pro viro bono et catholico*, Di Capua had to listen to seventeen articles of accusation. They concerned not only justification by faith, denial of papal primacy and purgatory, the heterodox propaganda he had promoted, correspondence with Martin Bucer, and relations with notorious heretics, but also denial of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist. These were extremely grave heresies, the pope ruled, but Di Capua had not been proved guilty of them, only suspected. He was therefore authorised to swear that he had never thought, said, or done anything against the Church; after a paternal admonition the pope finally gave him his blessing. [79] Like Grimani, however, Di Capua refused to abandon hope of the red hat and continued to plead his cause at the imperial court. In January 1554 the pope sent Muzzarelli there as nuncio, having shortly before created him archbishop of Conza, but thereby lost a valuable fifth column inside the fortress of the Holy Office. This permits the suspicion that tensions had reached a point at which the master of the Sacred Palace's position was no longer sustainable. Morone, himself under accusation as we shall see in the next chapter, tried - though cautiously - to support Di Capua's candidacy, [80] despite Muzzarelli's efforts to emphasise “the manifest infamy in Naples and Rome” of the archbishop of Otranto, who in his judgment should “owe more to His Holiness than to the father who begot him.” [81]

But while political considerations still seemed to prevail in Brussels, religious ones increasingly prevailed in Rome. This is shown by the pope's invocation, in explaining his refusals, of the need “not to discredit the Inquisition.” To the increasingly irritated cardinal of Mantua this was a ridiculous pretext, a bizarre “invention.” He evidently failed to grasp the constricted labyrinth in which Julius III had to move: either continue proclaiming innocent a prelate whose heterodox deviations he knew well, in order not to let the inquisitors win, or publicly contradict himself and abandon the man to the fate of an unrepentant heretic, in the hope that Charles V would accept it. Both weak and both approaching the end of their reigns, pope and emperor alike had to acknowledge that the Holy Office was unwilling for any reason to relax its severity, and that neither could overcome its vetoes even if they joined forces. Ercole Gonzaga did not hide his astonishment at the “variability” of so wavering and ineffectual a pope, [82] and neither did Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who was well aware of Julius III's perennial indecision and weakness. [83] He was always ready to promise “vigorous offices” with the inquisitors, and equally ready to retreat before their opposition. Once again, indeed, he found himself without an answer when they bluntly objected that, although they had reluctantly accepted the purgation and admitted that it had removed the *infamia iuris*, the *infamia facti* remained, heavy as a boulder. This suggested at the very least that they should “allow some time to pass and observe the actions of the said monsignor *in futurum*” - in other words, not very obliquely, wait for a new pope. With these words, on 27 May 1554 Innocenzo Del Monte informed Muzzarelli - and through him Charles V - that “in a matter so delicate and scandalous as heresy, His Beatitude cannot show himself less circumspect than the cardinals.” [84]

When tension with the Holy Office reached the point at which Álvarez de Toledo and Carafa threatened no longer to attend consistory, “saying that they did not wish to associate with Lutherans,” Julius III finally withdrew from a challenge far beyond his strength and informed Capilupi that he would no longer lift a finger for Di Capua. As Capilupi wrote to Mantua on 26 December 1554, the pope had been able to do nothing other than adopt the Holy Office's reasons. He let it be known that “no Neapolitan was imprisoned who did not name Otranto as a heretic,” so much so that one of the supreme inquisitors had dared tell him to his face that “if he made him cardinal, he would have to answer for it to God.” It also had to be considered that “for that cause alone, favouring heretics, trouble could be given to a pope in council,” and that Di Capua's elevation would compel him to call Grimani into the Sacred College as well. “All the inquisitors say that if these two were created, a Lutheran sect would be formed in the College, since there are already some inside who are not clean flour,” an only slightly veiled reference to Pole and Morone. A month later the pope communicated his now irrevocable decision to the imperial court, presenting it as dictated solely by the wish to free Charles V from responsibility for having so insistently sought the purple for that “prelate of good worth in every other respect,” the pope wrote, unaware of the paradoxical irony of his words, “except for this matter of heresy, into which we believe he fell because he took too much pleasure in his own wit, trusted too greatly in his prudence, associated with Valdés and other heretics, and thought to acquire a reputation for learning by interpreting Scripture backwards.” The question was closed. Responding to yet another appeal from the Venetian ambassador, the pope explained that “the cardinals told us they would give the emperor their possessions and their lives, but they wished to keep their consciences for themselves.” [85]

A few years later came the trial of the Messinese Giovan Francesco Verdura, bishop of Limassol on the island of Crete, whom Carnesecchi would describe as “a friend of the writings and school of Valdés.” [86] Summoned to Rome on 15 September 1552, he immediately travelled there “to clear himself [...] of the calumnies unjustly laid against him.” So Nuncio Beccadelli wrote on 8 October, presenting him as “a good Catholic man” who “shows himself most innocent.” [87] One recipient of these recommendations was Cervini, who replied rather curtly, promising to show Beccadelli's letter to the inquisitors and assuring him that Verdura would suffer no injustice: “No one has yet been held in prison for a single day who did not deserve to remain there for the rest of his life.” [88] Directed by Federici, the trial was quickly concluded. Verdura obtained his liberty on 16 March 1553 and escaped condemnation only through the canonical purgation decreed on 9 May. There can be no doubt that this resulted from Julius III's intervention, once again irritating the Holy Office. In 1558, after the election of Paul IV, it had Verdura confined again in the Roman prisons, from which only the popular tumults following the pope's death enabled him to escape. [89]

By accusing certain bishops, the Holy Office aimed not only to resist the penetration of heresy at the summit of the Church, but above all to assert jurisdiction over recruitment into the ecclesiastical hierarchy. After the narrow success achieved in the conclave of 1549-50, this jurisdiction - at least as a power of veto - sought to extend to cardinalatial and episcopal appointments, over which the inquisitors claimed the right to the final word. The inquisitors' consent had now become necessary not only to elect a pope but also to create a cardinal. As Adriano Prosperi has observed, “the maps governing access to the College of Cardinals had to make room for a new route, the one that passed through the new police of the faith.” [90] It was certainly not the route of the dithyrambic sonnets addressed to Julius III which Pietro Aretino still deluded himself he could follow, though he was aware of the opposition of the “wicked Theatines,” against whom he hurled accusations of hypocrisy. [91] Beyond preventing heterodox prelates, especially the *spirituali*, from being raised to the purple, however, it was necessary to condemn their heresies at the root.

Hence the opening of a second front in the offensive launched by the Holy Office after Julius III's election: the attack on Neapolitan Valdesianism, which had in fact been identified among its targets from the congregation's foundation. A month before the bull *Licet ab initio*, on 20 June 1542, Alvise Priuli had informed Beccadelli of the “noises” beginning “to be raised in Rome about the affairs of Naples.” They might perhaps be destined to fade only because Carafa could fear “that others intended to use such an occasion to introduce the Inquisition at Naples”: [92] the Spanish Inquisition, however, which would have excluded the Roman tribunal from the city from which had distilled the poison that had “infected [...] all Italy with heresy.” [93]

3. Gian Pietro Carafa, Archbishop of Naples, and the Anti-Valdesian Offensive

Serious disorders had occurred at Naples in 1547, led by several barons who saw the proposed introduction of that tribunal as an instrument for strengthening royal power. Among those at the forefront were men suspected of heresy, briefly allied with the Roman inquisitors in the struggle against the Spanish viceroy. For this reason too Cardinal Carafa took advantage of Paul III's supreme pleasure in displeasing Charles V to obtain appointment as archbishop of Naples in February 1549, with the predictable result of provoking the emperor's anger. Charles refused the *placet* for the appointment of this sworn enemy of the House of Austria, always ready to launch fiery words against Spanish rule. Don Pedro de Toledo himself immediately informed the Habsburg sovereign, stressing that Carafa - his own bitterest enemy - had many relatives in the kingdom of Naples and that he therefore awaited an explicit order before allowing him to take possession of the diocese. [94] This would occur only in May 1551, although the viceroy continued to express pessimism for the future, since Carafa had always been hostile to Charles V and had never ceased plotting against him. [95]

During the conclave that elected Julius III, one cardinal whispered that it would be unwise to elect the Theatine “because it was said that at the time of the tumults in Naples he had incited Paul III to make war on the kingdom,” and because he was a man “inclined to war.” Cardinal Savelli said that he had heard Carafa declare *apertis verbis* “that the imperialists were worse than the Turks.” [96] Once elected pope, moreover, he would not hesitate to unleash a criminal war against Charles V and even prosecute him for heresy, together with his son Philip, seizing every opportunity to vent his “long-aged hatred” of Spain. [97] Politics and religion, the resentment of a great Neapolitan aristocrat against Habsburg rule and the founder of the Holy Office's total dedication to the struggle against heresy, were one and the same in the Theatine cardinal. Becoming archbishop of Naples meant not only preventing any attempt to introduce the Iberian Inquisition into the kingdom, but also assuming the function of delegate of the Holy Office and thereby directing the hunt for heretics, beginning with the many Neapolitan disciples and epigones of Juan de Valdés. Politics and religion were also united in his awareness that these men were now led by the English cardinal, [98] and that the Spanish exile who had come to Italy to escape the Suprema had been an agent of Charles V, [99] further evidence of the emperor's protection of heretics and heresies.

Shortly after the conclave ended, on 18 March 1550, Julius III wrote to the Habsburg sovereign requesting his consent to Carafa's appointment, [100] partly in order to remove him from Rome. He received

another refusal, justified by the fact that this powerful and overbearing prelate had always exerted all his strength to stir the waters in the kingdom. [101] Nor did the appeals of Nuncio Sebastiano Pighino have better results. On 5 September he reported to Rome that the emperor had remained immovable in rejecting a man who had always "professed attachment to the crown of France and always given shelter to all the banished men of Naples." [102] The pope could do nothing but ask Charles V for an act of generosity, pointing out that the problem would soon resolve itself if he allowed "this poor, unhealthy old man to die in peace," as he had written to Brussels on 13 October. [103] Two weeks later Rome again explained to the nuncio that the pope did not know how to untangle the knot without "entering into judgment and dispute in consistory with this good man, of whom - to put it in a word - His Beatitude is no less disgusted than perhaps His Majesty is, [...] full to the eyes with the inconstancy and capriciousness of this cardinal." [104]

The decrepit Theatine cardinal obstinately refused to die, however, and would eventually succeed in becoming archbishop of Naples, outliving Pope Del Monte and Charles V, placing the tiara on Marcello II, and ascending the throne of Peter himself. In any event, having obtained the appointment but been kept away from Naples by a feeble pope and an emperor eager to protect the heretics proliferating there, Carafa sent as his vicar an uncompromising inquisitor, Scipione Rebiba. Rebiba immediately launched a campaign of repression against the Valdesian movement, still alive and vigorous in the capital of the kingdom and possessing substantial branches in the provinces, from Calabria to Apulia. Dozens upon dozens of people were tried and extradited to Rome on Rebiba's initiative. His inquisitorial zeal, the Theatine Antonio Caracciolo would write, "was so effective [...] that boatloads of prisoners were often sent [...] from Naples to Rome, among whom were also some nobles." [105] It would serve no purpose to list their names and histories here. [106] Taken together, however, they reveal Carafa's acute awareness that the source from which the *spirituali* had drunk in various ways had welled up precisely there, and that there the incriminating material against them had to be sought, as we have seen in Di Capua's case. One example was the Calabrian priest Apollonio Merenda, imprisoned in Rome in 1551 and subjected to a trial that ended with his abjuration in May 1553. [107] His testimony was all the more valuable to the inquisitors because in the early 1540s he had lived at Viterbo as Pole's chaplain. He revealed everything about that experience in his interrogations, during which, according to Carnesecchi, he confessed the "articles [...] that came out of Valdés's workshop." [108]

Giulia Gonzaga herself became the object of investigation. Vittore Soranzo had mentioned her in his *confessio* of 28 June 1551, stating only that she was "much devoted to the doctrine of Valdés," [109] while Merenda supplied far more detailed information and named the many suspicious figures who had frequented her. [110] On 22 December 1552 the future cardinal of Santa Severina and supreme inquisitor Giulio Antonio Santoro noted that the noblewoman was regarded as a heretic and had therefore been summoned to Rome. [111] Shortly before, Girolamo Morra had written to Don Ferrante Gonzaga that Rebiba, "a reckless person without any regard," was proceeding "inconsiderately" in his repressive fury and targeting Gonzaga in particular. The inquisitors questioned everyone who fell into their hands about her, lending credibility to the suspicion that the investigations arose solely from Carafa's inveterate hatred of the Mantuan house. "What they are trying to learn derives from her association with Valdés and from the writings he composed at the lady's request," Morra explained, adding that after the Spanish exile's death those writings had been sent to Flaminio, then in Rome, "so that he might translate them with the opinion of the cardinal of England and the master of the Sacred Palace [Tommaso Badia], and then have them printed." [112] The same information was communicated by Donna Giulia herself to her cousin, the cardinal of Mantua, on 18 February 1553. In the absence of evidence, she observed, nothing authorised the inquisitors to behave with such arrogance "that not a scoundrel passes through their hands whom they do not question about me." [113] Unable to perceive the profound political and religious displacement under way, Ercole and Ferrante Gonzaga refused to believe that their social rank was insufficient to protect them from the Holy Office or that "our Lady Donna Giulia Gonzaga" [114] could be accused. They were mistaken. The power of the great Italian houses was rapidly eroding with the establishment of a *pax hispanica* that also arose from Charles V's renunciation of open conflict with the papacy and the consequent marginalisation of men such as Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza and Ferrante Gonzaga himself. The latter remained governor of Milan until 1554, when, burdened by debt,

he was replaced by the duke of Alba, principal representative of the rival Álvarez de Toledo clan, which also included an influential cardinal inquisitor.

Both Donna Giulia and Morra continued to believe that Pole's royal blood or supreme prestige could silence every slanderer, although the noblewoman herself eventually accepted the advice to “speak properly” to Carafa, despite knowing his unscrupulous duplicity. “I believe Your Most Illustrious Lordship knows that cardinal's mind and how it is necessary to deal with him adroitly,” [115] she wrote to her cousin Ercole Gonzaga, well aware that he considered Carafa “the proudest cardinal in this College, hypocritical and choleric.” [116] Even the highest reaches of social hierarchy and political power, then, had to recognise that neither an illustrious name nor the protection of the imperial eagle could any longer guarantee impunity or serve as a safe-conduct. The Theatine cardinal was certainly not displeased that the Holy Office struck at the Gonzagas, mastiffs of Habsburg power in Italy, just as the rival Álvarez de Toledo clan did all it could in Rome and Naples to thwart their ambitions. The crucial issue, however, was and remained religious. In a letter to Don Ferrante on 25 March 1553, Giulia Gonzaga again expressed her indignation at the charges directed against her, complaining that the suspicions centred solely on “the association with and writings of Valdés, a matter from fourteen years ago now revived.” With a mixture of anger and reticence she denounced “the strange methods used in that tribunal of the Inquisition,” which inspired such fear in common opinion that witnesses did not say what they knew, “but what they imagine and what they think will please those most reverend lords, who have ministers exceedingly skilled in persuasion.” As for Valdés's writings, she concluded, if they regarded them as heterodox they need only prohibit them; for her part she promised to obey every ban. [117]

By then Don Pedro de Toledo had been dead for a month, having died in Florence as the guest of his son-in-law Cosimo de' Medici. With the arrival at Naples of his successor, Cardinal Pedro Pacheco, the air became easier to breathe, partly because of Pacheco's profound hostility toward his colleague Juan Álvarez de Toledo, who until then had been able to maintain a direct channel with his viceroy brother. Perhaps to atone for the penetration of heresy even among his closest collaborators, the latter had not hesitated to support the Theatine's vigorous repression at Naples, although he knew that Charles V had tried to prevent Carafa's appointment as archbishop of the city. On 7 January 1553, at Gaeta, a few weeks before his death, he drafted a lengthy memorial for the emperor in which he also discussed the presence of heretics. He informed Charles that several months earlier he had urged Carafa to act against this scandalous disgrace, and that the Theatine had immediately proposed coming personally to Naples to deal with it, which had not proved possible. They had therefore followed the course of trying several men of low social condition, about twenty of whom were sent to Rome, and then moved to arrest persons of higher rank, such as lawyers and physicians. Their interrogations produced evidence against numerous important people, clerics and laymen, suggesting the need for caution. In the viceroy's judgment, however, the loss of force in inquisitorial action resulted above all from Julius III's weakness (*floxedad*), which had led the Roman Holy Office not to proceed against them and to abandon the promising path begun to remedy that plague, which spread and grew from day to day throughout the kingdom. [118]

The religious and political conflict under way in the papal curia was therefore also perceived at Naples, where Pope Del Monte's weakness in the struggle against heresy was viewed with some concern. In any event, the very large number of persons investigated and the high social rank of many of them undoubtedly suggested mild penalties, to avert the risk that the Neapolitan nobility would once again raise the banner of revolt against the Inquisition, Roman or Spanish, as it had in 1547. On 4 May 1554 Cardinal Pacheco informed Charles V that proceedings were being conducted with the greatest prudence and reported learning from Rebiba that many came to be reconciled in secret. [119] Shortly before, on 7 March, in a letter to Prince Philip, he had expressed astonishment that Cardinals Álvarez de Toledo and Carpi, though aware of the past tumults, had now become more obedient to the Holy Office than to the emperor. He suggested firmly informing the pope that this was not the time to introduce innovations, especially in a matter so hateful to the city and the entire kingdom. [120] On 3 October Pacheco also informed Charles V that the inquisitors were investigating Donna Giulia and many others formerly close to Valdés; and on 26 November he urged the

emperor to pay close attention to the Lutheran question in order to avert the grave harm threatened by those heresies, since many places were now contaminated. [121] Many Valdesians on trial in Rome continued to reveal everything, predictably accusing Gonzaga, as indicated by the discussion of her case at the congregation of 9 February 1554. [122] Meanwhile at Venice, on 27 October of the previous year, Benedetto Florio, alias Lorenzo Tizzano, had confessed to having "discussed the opinions of Valdés with Lady Donna Giulia twice at San Francesco in Naples" in 1542. [123]

The wave of repression that then struck Naples was accompanied by a climate of terror, as shown by the case of Girolamo Scannapeco, a prominent lawyer who voluntarily presented himself in Rome to clear himself of accusations arising from his dealings with several heterodox figures. He died there in December 1552, crushed "for the sake of his honour," even though "nothing whatever was found against him." Yet the inquisitors "say that they are *innocentes a sanguine istius*," wrote Morra, indignant at the brazen manner in which Carafa asserted that no one had ever ordered Scannapeco summoned, still less arrested, and that "he fled here without reason and perhaps prompted by his conscience." "See, Your Most Reverend Lordship, where we stand!" he concluded, stressing that the Theatine was going about saying "that henceforth he wishes to proceed with gentleness and appoint so many confessors that everyone may go and confess his sins and receive absolution, and thereafter let them beware; and that he wishes to have the writings of Valdés condemned." [124] Such promises were naturally hardly credible, especially from one who had always opposed every form of irenicism. They nevertheless reveal the growing irritation provoked by the Holy Office's feverish activity at Naples, certainly long prepared and accelerated by the numerous abjurations at Rome.

It is far more difficult to establish what information, proofs, and incriminating elements those records delivered to the inquisitors; what networks of collusion and complicity; what lines of investigation they suggested concerning the disciples of Valdés and Flaminio. We know nothing of the contents of those lost dossiers except for several extracts from Merenda's, datable between June 1551 and July 1552, which were attached to the proceedings against Carnesecchi and Morone. [125] It is significant that they survived precisely because of their value as inquisitorial evidence against the *spirituali*, on whom the surviving passages indeed concentrate. They evoke the Calabrian's initiation into Valdesian doctrines and his subsequent passage into the *Ecclesia viterbiensis* in the early 1540s. With predictable reticence, Merenda confessed his membership in that world, admitting that he had read the *Beneficio di Cristo* and other heterodox works several times "piece by piece," and recalled Flaminio's lessons on the Gospel of Matthew in the presence of Pole and his household. He also reported that the booklet "had greatly pleased" Morone, as had certain *Considerationi* and *Preguntas* of Valdés which Merenda himself had read at Viterbo. [126] There, however, Carnesecchi and Flaminio had presented him only with the "outer shell" of justification by faith alone, without mentioning the "consequences," but insisting that works "necessarily proceed from faith, like good fruit from a good tree and heat from fire, and that whoever feels vividly within himself this justification through Christ may be certain of his salvation." Having now become a "great Christian," wholly immersed in Valdesian spirituality, Merenda later accompanied Pole and Flaminio on the Tridentine legation of 1542-43. [127]

Several pages published by Italian exiles *religionis causa*, such as Pier Paolo Vergerio and Francesco Negri, must likewise have appeared to the Theatine cardinal as eloquent incriminating evidence against the *spirituali*. In their anxiety for orthodoxy, they stigmatised the cautious duplicity of the *Ecclesia viterbiensis* in words that amounted to indirect denunciations to the Holy Office. The first to take up the rod was the former bishop of Capodistria. Newly arrived in the Grisons and perhaps eager to atone for a long Nicodemite season, in his reply to the Venetian Index of 1549 he attacked those who, though they had known the truth, preferred not to draw its consequences and persisted in dissimulation, in "waiting for the occasion and the opportune time," rather than renounce their privileges and cease "enjoying the comforts and delights of their clerical estates." This accusation of cowardice was directed first of all against Pole, readily identifiable as the cardinal reputed "to taste the sweetness of the Gospel," who ought to have declared himself a soldier of Christ "with all his school." [128]

Still more explicit was Negri's invective in the second edition of the *Tragedia del libero arbitrio*, printed in 1551. He did not hesitate to name Pole, Soranzo, and Grimani, "who, it is true, understand the article of

justification and oppose certain abuses, but go to Mass and adore the pope." Hence the need to denounce the scandalous compromises of those prelates who, although "understanding the truth, went on dissembling and plastering it over for fear of losing their reputation at court," and in so doing legitimised the similar conduct of many who looked to them as models. [129] Negri had previously named others, clerics and laymen: Priuli, Flaminio, Morone, Ascanio Colonna, Camillo Orsini, and numerous "men of very great authority both in letters and in other worldly dignities." [130] Against them he hurled accusations of opportunistic duplicity which the Roman inquisitors could reverse and interpret as proof of covert pro-Reformation sympathies.

4. "Are You Asking Me about Cardinals?"

All the prelates named in Negri's *Tragedia* were then under investigation, in order to keep bishops such as Soranzo, Grimani, and Di Capua from the cardinalate and cardinals such as Pole and Morone from the papacy. It was therefore necessary to strengthen the arsenal of evidence with which to fight them and avert the risk of the débâcle that had been escaped by a hair's breadth in the last conclave. Among the papers now preserved in the archive of the Holy Office there is no trial dossier on the English cardinal, nor probably was one ever created, despite the tenacious investigations directed against him. [131] This is explained by the fact that depositions concerning him remained embedded in the interrogation records and were never extracted and placed in a separate dossier devoted to him. When the proceeding finally assumed formal shape - during the pontificate of Paul IV - Pole was absent, engaged in restoring Catholicism in his native island, where the protection of Philip and Mary enabled him to avoid the summons to Rome issued by Pope Carafa in 1557 after depriving him of the legation. Confirmation is provided by Morone's dossier, where page after page of depositions collected in various cities concerned not him but Pole. As such they were not transcribed in the copy of the trial records delivered to Morone in early July 1559 for the preparation of his defence, [132] but probably in a separate *Libellus in quo [sunt] inditia contra reverendissimum Polum*. [133] It is obvious, moreover, that during the preliminary investigation inquisitors questioned witnesses about everything they knew, and later divided the material gathered among the files of individual defendants when the case assumed formal shape. This also explains why the brief of 24 June 1555, by which Paul IV opened the investigations, referred not only to Morone but to all persons suspected of heresy, whatever their condition, status, rank, or dignity. [134]

It is enough to leaf through those thousands of pages to perceive the poverty of the incriminating documentation preceding the brief: an *informatio* of Giovan Battista Scotti datable to March 1551, [135] an anodyne deposition by Reginaldo Nerli of 1 June 1553, and finally a confused summary of what Don Lorenzo Davidico said a few months later to Cardinals Carafa, Cervini, and Carpi and then to the inquisitor of Perugia, Matteo Lachi. [136] Several attachments dated from earlier years: brief extracts from the trials of Soranzo (1551), Merenda (1551-52), and Bernardo Bartoli (1552), [137] to whom we shall shortly return; [138] several letters addressed to Scotti and later delivered by him to the tribunal in 1552; [139] and a dramatic letter from the Lateran Canon Regular Celso Martinengo, who on 15 February 1551, already preparing to flee to Geneva, asked the

his fellow friar Ippolito Chizzola to consult Soranzo, Grimani, Pole, and Morone in order to calm the conflicts troubling his conscience.[140] This amounted to very little, all things considered, given the many heterodox figures tried in those years, many of whom were undoubtedly informed about the religious views of eminent prelates known to everyone for their social rank, prestige, and political and pastoral roles. It is difficult to imagine that men such as Cesare Flaminio,[141] Andrea da Volterra, Pietro Gelido, Ippolito Chizzola, or one of the many Valdesians from Naples extradited to Rome between 1551 and 1553 knew nothing of facts, events, episodes, or even mere gossip and slander concerning Pole and Morone. Yet their names do not appear in the trial records known today.

Consider the example of Ranieri Gualano, the Neapolitan heretic whom an inquisitorial document datable to March 1551 described as a close friend of Soranzo and a "thoroughgoing Lutheran, [...] who, if he were in our hands, could tell us many things about these men."[142] On 27 September of that year he was confined in the prison of Ripetta, where he was still held in December, when he was questioned about a heterodox Paduan whom the bishop of Bergamo had assured him was "one of ours,"[143] and he remained there in the spring of the following year, as appears from a letter in which Cocciano informed Seripando on 19 March that he had heard that "Ranieri Gualano has said a great deal, that is, named many people, and they confronted him with Messer Apollonio [Merenda], and he proved his case against him."[144] Yet there is no trace of any deposition by him against Soranzo and Morone in the trials of the latter. As for Merenda, as we have seen, the Milanese cardinal was mentioned in the records of his examinations only where he recounted how in 1543 he had received the Benefit of Christ at Trent and how, in Naples, he had answered Giulia Gonzaga's questions about Morone, telling her that Priuli and Flaminio spoke very highly of him and "that he seemed quite capable of understanding justification through Christ."[145]

The fact that the Roman tribunal did not press Merenda - or any of the other defendants then on trial - is explained by the pope's explicit prohibition on questioning accused persons about cardinals, a prohibition whose effectiveness is therefore clear. It was in fact a massive obstacle placed in the path of the Holy Office's action against the spirituali. It is thus unsurprising that the ban caused sharp tensions during interrogations, which were often conducted jointly by representatives of the divergent political lines that clashed within the tribunal: on one side, the hard-line inquisitors, utterly loyal to Carafa; on the other, Julius III's trusted men, charged with enforcing the pope's will. On 18 February 1552, for example, Federici was assigned to question Merenda, but to frame the questions in such a way that he could answer only yes or no; and on 5 December he was to question him in the presence of Fra Michele Ghislieri, though restricting himself to factual matters.[146] Their joint presence on 2 April of that year at the canonical purgation of two Augustinian friars in the residence of Cardinal Cicala, Federici's patron,[147] seems to attest the recurrence of this kind of mutual surveillance carried out in the name and on behalf of the different and conflicting authorities to whom they were then obliged to report. The Lombard jurist would later recall, for example, that at the end of an examination in which both he and Ghislieri had repeatedly urged Cesare Flaminio to "unburden his conscience and say what he knew without regard for anyone," Flaminio had replied: "Are you asking me about cardinals?" This also seems to imply that the papal prohibition was known to the defendants themselves, and that someone had presumably taken the trouble to inform them so that they might conduct themselves accordingly. "I," Federici continued, "in keeping with the order I had received, told him no, that I was not asking him about them; and the Most Reverend Alexandrino told me I had done wrong to say so; and I answered him that I wished to obey the pope, who was the master."[148]

The incident did not end there. Ghislieri immediately informed the Theatine cardinal of the quarrel. Some time later Federici went to see Carafa "to persuade him not to proceed so openly against Pope Julius," and there he again found Fra Michele. He once more insisted on the obligation to inform the pontiff about ongoing proceedings, striving "to make him understand that in the end Our Lord was a good man and a Catholic." These words alone suffice to reveal the inquisitors' furious exasperation with Pope Del Monte, ready to erupt as soon as Federici proposed drafting "a report to be sent to His Holiness." Carafa, in fact, reacted with abuse:[149]

> Instead of calming down, he flew into a rage against me, saying that there were matters concerning me as well in connection with the Inquisition. I told him that I would never again set foot in the Inquisition unless he told me quid mali fecerim in ea, and I tried to leave. Then he rose and held me back and told me that he had nothing against me, but thought he might say a word to make me more zealous without my taking offense. I then told him that I knew very well what he meant, but that the fault was not mine and that I would clarify everything in the Inquisition. And so, at the first congregation coram cardinalibus tantum, knowing that the cardinal of Naples had become angry over the words I had spoken to Flaminio, I said that I wished to bear no responsibility because of the order given me by the Most Illustrious Monsignor Puteo on behalf of Our Lord, and that they should decide among themselves how I was to proceed in matters concerning cardinals. They ordered that, if cardinals happened to be mentioned in the examinations of defendants, either they themselves, Monsignor Alessandrino, or I should record it, with the notary, ad partem.

Ad partem: that is, outside the official record, in confidential notes excluded from the formal proceedings, whose use ultimately depended on the pontiff. Federici's account also reveals that some years later Ghislieri, by then Cardinal Alessandrino, admitted to him that he had nevertheless exercised "diligence with Cesare Flaminio," in defiance of Julius III's order, though he had failed to extract from him "anything at all about Morone."[150] The Holy Office, in other words, reserved the right to disobey the pope and to question defendants even about members of the Sacred College, who in practice constituted the primary target of its action. The unscrupulous political use of the inquisitorial axe wielded by Carafa emerges just as clearly from what Federici reported shortly afterward concerning certain revelations by Fra Giovanni Buzio da Montalcino, arrested at the end of 1551, about a "dead cardinal" whose name he refrained from giving - almost certainly Girolamo Capodiferro - though he declared himself ready to reveal it if asked. During his interrogations the Franciscan preacher had claimed that the mysterious cardinal had urged him to defend the doctrine preached by a heretic according to which Christ was present in the Eucharist only in spirit, thereby accusing him of complicity with a Calvinist. These startling allegations, when read in the congregation, aroused the indignation of the cardinals, Carafa among them, who at once turned against Montalcino, saying that "he was a scoundrel and was not telling the truth." Later, while escorting one of those cardinals home, Federici was asked with a smile what he thought of the affair: "What do you think of these inquisitors of ours? Do you believe that if this man [...] had spoken against those good men Pole or Morone [...] he would have been thought to lie about them rather than to tell the truth?" In other words, many would have been willing to believe him, whereas he could be accused of lying when he implicated a cardinal who, besides being highly "favored" by the pope, could not offer "the competition that these two can" in a future conclave and therefore could and should be defended from such infamous charges of heresy.[151]

Julius III had occupied the papal throne for scarcely a year, and already the contest over his succession had begun. The Theatine cardinal was by then "openly at odds" with him and always ready to obstruct and contradict him "in matters of the Inquisition," reproaching him for his deplorable laxity, while His Holiness sometimes did not refrain from abusing that "poor, sick old man," of whom he said he was "sick to his stomach."[152] Like the authors of the pasquinades, Julius III believed that the uncompromising rigor inspiring the Theatine's zeal was merely a hypocritical mask concealing his lust for power, and that he was moved solely by "malice and envy of the papacy."[153] Carafa in turn harbored profound contempt for Pope Del Monte and, once he became Pope Paul IV, would boast that he had often contradicted him "in matters of the Inquisition and shown him that one must not proceed lukewarmly," thereby provoking his frequent "rebukes."[154]

Chapter Thirteen

"He Looked as Though He Wanted to Eat Him Alive": The Spirituali on Trial

1. The Trial of Fra Bernardo Bartoli

The papal prohibition on questioning defendants about cardinals - which, as everyone understood, meant above all about Pole and Morone - was a formidable obstacle to the offensive unleashed by the inquisitors, since any record of interrogation containing such questions, if produced in court, would have lost its legal validity as an obvious violation of a papal order. This did not prevent the Holy Office from continuing to collect evidence and depositions against the spirituali in order to enrich its dossiers, postponing their use until better times. For the moment, it merely prevented their use. It therefore required the utmost caution in keeping secret interrogations under lock and key, since their discovery would mean being caught in flagrant disobedience, with the risk that the pontiff might finally decide to replace those inquisitors with men he trusted. Precisely because they were recorded in the strictest secrecy, such interrogations naturally do not appear in the few surviving trial files, and they were probably lost in the burning of the Ripetta archive during the popular riots that erupted in Rome at the death of Pope Carafa on 18 August 1559.

We do, however, know something about one of them, because at a certain point the pope was informed of it. The result was pandemonium, threatening to overwhelm Carafa and with him his inquisitorial strategy. The records in question concerned the Florentine Dominican Bernardo Bartoli, who in the early 1540s had lived in the convent of Santa Maria in Gradi at Viterbo, where he became a disciple of Pole, who in 1543 presented him to Morone as a suitable preacher for Modena.[1] The following year Di Capua sent him to preach at Otranto, equipped with two copies of the Benefit of Christ given to him by the Milanese cardinal.[2] In 1551-52, however, Bartoli was imprisoned at the Minerva on the charge of having embraced the Lutheran doctrine of justification and was forced to abjure some ten errors "dependent upon this one."[3] It is reasonable to suppose that he was summoned to Rome precisely because the inquisitors knew of his links with Pole and Morone. Bartoli, indeed, supplied abundant information about them during a trial that one of his fellow friars called "the most important and scandalous ever held in Rome,"[4] not least because it soon became widely known, "almost through the public report of the friars of the Roman province," to whom Bartoli did not hesitate to recount his adventures in every detail, in defiance of the secrecy of the Holy Office.[5]

Nothing survives of that trial, but the records of the proceedings against Morone provide substantial documentation on Fra Bernardo's affair. It is no coincidence that Bartoli was the first witness to be questioned, on 7 June 1555, immediately after Carafa's election to the papacy. On that occasion he reported that he had previously been prosecuted by the Holy Office, but also "examined by the Reverend Master of the Sacred Palace, Fra Girolamo [Muzzarelli] of Bologna, and by the Reverend Father Master Stefano [Usodimare] of Genoa, then vicar of the order; and three or four times I was examined by them, and once Messer Girolamo [Federici], bishop of Sagone, spoke to me, and another time he examined me."[6] Inquisitor of Genoa from 1539 to 1547, Usodimare had been summoned to Rome as prior of the convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva and consultant to the Holy Office, whose meetings he attended throughout 1549 and again from the beginning of 1551.[7] In 1560 Federici would say that Michele Ghislieri, acting on Carafa's orders and in Usodimare's presence, had been the first to question Bartoli, and that Usodimare had taken it upon himself to inform the master of the Sacred Palace, who in turn alerted Julius III.[8] Once again the pope did not hesitate to throw the weight of his authority into the balance, immediately dispatching the usual Muzzarelli and Federici to the Minerva with the task of dismantling the machinery of accusation that the inquisitors were secretly preparing while once again evading papal authority in pursuit of their own political and religious objectives. Fra Bernardo's sensational affair thus laid bare the deep division at the summit of the Church and gave rise to an open clash in which many Dominicans - Bartoli's own order, but also the inquisitorial order par excellence - played a decisive role on the side of the pontiff rather than the Holy Office.[9]

The deposition made by the Florentine friar in early July 1555 makes it possible to reconstruct part of the one he had given three years earlier, in which he had denounced numerous fellow friars and some priests, but above all Contarini, Pole, Morone, Badia, Di Capua, Carnesecchi, Priuli, Flaminio, Colonna, and Gualano. Significantly, he had reconstructed his heretical genealogy beginning with Contarini, who by 1552 had been dead for ten years and against whom a posthumous trial was then assembled,[10] before implicating above all the cardinal of England, whom he had known at Viterbo: his work of proselytism, the many Lutheran books circulating in his household, and the composition of the Benefit of Christ and other heterodox texts. No less serious were Bartoli's revelations about Morone, a convinced advocate of "justification according to the explanation of the Lutherans," who had urged him to preach it in Modena and authorized him to read prohibited books.[11] He also remembered having reported in his first examination a letter from the bishop on confession that "had given great satisfaction to the Lutherans," and Bartolomeo della Pergola's preaching in Modena in 1544, after which the cardinal had struggled to save him from inquisitorial condemnation.[12] It is hardly surprising that, when he learned of accusations about which the inquisitors had never told him anything, Julius III decided to retake the reins of the Holy Office, which had escaped his control. Hence the difficult task assigned to Muzzarelli and Federici of defusing the explosive mixture that was accumulating and of "examining Bartoli rigorously," forcing him "to tell the truth, because he knew that these things about Morone were nonsense."[13]

It was then that Julius III, furious with that "worthless friar,"[14] called the Dominican order into the affair, and a substantial part of it offered its support in checking the initiatives of the Inquisition so as to avoid being implicated in its underground anti-papal action. Many of the protagonists in the conflict then raging at the summit of the Curia competed for that "simpleton" Bartoli[15]

to wrench from his mouth whatever served their purposes, beginning with "the Most Reverend Monsignor Alessandrino, on the order of some cardinal of the Inquisition," whom the pope tried to restrain by throwing the weight of his intermittent authority into the balance. Fortified by Julius III's support, the prestige of his office, and the backing of the order, Muzzarelli summoned Fra Bernardo several times for questioning, sometimes accompanied by Usodimare and sometimes in the presence of the inquisitorial notary, though without drawing up any record.[16] Federici brought heavy pressure to bear on him, with intimidation, threats of torture, and promises of assistance, to make him understand that his accusations would bring "infamy upon so many great and most reverend lords, namely Contarini, England, and Morone." The pope ordered the master of the Sacred Palace to search the latter's archives for pastoral letters capable of disproving the friar's revelations. Shortly afterward Bartoli became the victim of a genuine sleight of hand by Muzzarelli, who made a compromising letter disappear and showed him another instead, which Bartoli himself had to acknowledge as perfectly orthodox, to the point of doubting memories that by then went back ten years.[17] In the end his resistance collapsed, and on 27 May he was induced to ask "forgiveness" and sign a formal retraction.[18]

The trial ended in July 1552 with the sentence read at the Minerva before "all the friars of the convent" and a veritable parterre de rois of inquisitors and Dominicans, revealing the importance of the affair and the sensation it had caused: Ghislieri, Muzzarelli, Federici, Usodimare, Lachi, the Roman provincial Matteo Strozzi, and the master general of the order himself, Francesco Romeo da Castiglione, into whose hands Bartoli pronounced his abjuration, according to the sentence signed by the Dominican cardinal Juan Álvarez de Toledo.[19] There were too many figures, and figures of too great authority, for it not to be clear that the poor Florentine friar had found himself at the center of a web of conflicts so tangled that he could not escape it. He nevertheless perceived its knots, distinguishing between those who had "inquisited" him and those who had "examined" him: the Holy Office on one side and the pope's watchdogs on the other, aligned on opposing fronts, with Bartoli himself as the prize each side sought to win in order to make him confirm or retract his charges. This time, then, it was the pontiff who forced the issue and cheated at the game in order to secure the friar's retraction, although Bartoli refused to withdraw the accusations against Pole and retracted only those against Morone. A few years later he would repeat them exactly as before, declaring that he had been "deceived and seduced" by the master of the Sacred Palace.[20]

Julius III, however, was not satisfied with this partial retraction. To guard against further danger, at the end of 1553, shortly before sending Muzzarelli as papal nuncio to the court of Charles V, he asked him about Morone's trial file and, on learning that Usodimare had custody of it, ordered him to obtain it. "I received the proceedings and delivered them to His Holiness in the chamber where he slept," the master of the Sacred Palace would testify in 1558, adding that the pope "placed them in a small casket that he kept on the bedside table, where he had summaries of other trials he had received from me," in particular those of Di Capua and Grimani.[21] Only in 1557 would Muzzarelli learn that in 1555 Julius III - heedless of inquisitorial secrecy - had entrusted those trial papers to the Milanese cardinal himself, on the eve of his departure for the Diet of Augsburg.[22] In fact, the circumstance that they were then in the hands of Usodimare, elected master general of the Dominicans in May 1553, suggests that when Julius III asked for Morone's trial he meant only Bartoli's deposition. The pope, whose irritation is evident in the very distrust with which he concealed explosive documents in his private rooms, showed no knowledge of the testimony of Giovan Battista Scotti, Reginaldo Nerli, and Lorenzo Davidico, which the inquisitors had already obtained.[23]

During his trial Morone would make contradictory statements, sometimes at odds with Muzzarelli's, about how he had learned of the affair; about the letters that disappeared from and reappeared in his archive in order to confuse Bartoli; and about who had delivered to him, and when, the documents later found among the papers seized at his arrest, enclosed in a small file on which he had written in his own hand "servanda" - to be preserved.[24] Bartoli's trial papers, on the other hand, were never found. The day after his arrest the Milanese cardinal would declare that Julius III had given them to him in 1555, when, besides discussing "the article on justification of the Most Reverend Contarini," the pope had spoken to him about the "denunciations" of which he had been the victim. On that occasion, Morone would state, the pope embraced him, giving him "the blessing and absolution from everything in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti; and with tears he told me that he hoped that through me Germany might be restored to the ancient and true religion."[25] The pope had therefore heard of other "denunciations" against the cardinal and assured him that he intended to verify whether they existed in the Holy Office and, if so, to annul them, "because he knew them all to be calumnies."[26] Although the pope's death shortly afterward prevented that intention from being carried out, Bartoli's retraction was a serious defeat for the Holy Office, caught red-handed violating papal orders and effectively contradicted by the very Fra Bernardo who should have been its trump card. Hence Julius III's attempt to turn the inquisitors' misstep into a defeat by forcing them to promise that they would refrain from similar initiatives in the future.

An extraordinary account is offered by the "separate letter concerning the affairs of the Most Reverend Pole" sent by Filippo Gheri to Ludovico Beccadelli on 29 April 1553,[27] intelligible only in light of Bartoli's revelations and the discovery of the inquisitorial plots against Pole and Morone. The words spoken by the cardinal of Carpi to Vincenzo Parpaglia in the summer of 1552 may probably be traced back to Fra Bernardo's deposition. Parpaglia, once closely connected with the Ecclesia viterbiensis, was told "that many things had been heard against Cardinal Pole and that writings or loose papers were in hand which [Carpi], to do Pole a service, had suppressed and not allowed to come to light." The matter was later discussed again between the two cardinals in Rome in the spring of the following year, when the cardinal of England, seeking to escape the difficult defensive position into which his adversaries wished to force him, told Carpi that he regretted "that he had suppressed them," because "in trying to do him a favor he had done him a great disservice." All the more so because Carpi had carefully avoided discussing the substance of the charges, which remained generic and based on "nothing certain, but all in the air and in a cloud, without conclusion," though they undoubtedly concerned Bartoli's confession.[28]

Only in light of the events reconstructed thus far can one grasp the political significance of the surreal conversation between Pole and Carafa held at San Paolo fuori le Mura in April 1553, the outcome of an initiative promoted by the pope in which the master of the Sacred Palace again played a leading role. There is no doubt that Bartoli's secret trial and subsequent retraction had poured oil on the already blazing tension between Pope Del Monte and the Holy Office and made the atmosphere in the Sacred College still heavier, since, after what had happened, political and religious conflicts could not fail to affect personal relations as

well. Hence the pontiff's attempt to reach a compromise, whose political importance is demonstrated by the number and stature of the preliminary meetings: Carpi, Cervini, Carafa, Pole, Federici, Gheri, Muzzarelli, and Parpaglia engaged in "discussions" and sought a way out. Morone also participated indirectly in these negotiations through Gheri, although Gheri never named him in the entire long letter to Beccadelli. The fact that the conversation took place at San Paolo, where Pole then resided, on the eve of returning to his homeland to restore Catholicism there, makes clear that after the pope's sharp intervention to curb his maneuvers it was Carafa who had to make the pilgrimage to Canossa.

Julius III's political will is plainly visible behind the scenes, represented by Muzzarelli, who was in Pole's chamber when Carafa arrived - an arrival certainly not unexpected, though Carafa wished the visit to seem casual: "One day the cardinal of Naples, going or pretending to go to the Seven Churches, began at San Paolo."[29] That the English cardinal was then in a position of strength is also confirmed by the long wait he ostentatiously imposed on his visitor, a man who had repeatedly shown himself extremely sensitive to the respect owed to his aristocratic lineage and cardinalitial dignity. It was a calculated move, which Carafa had to endure patiently - not a virtue that came naturally to him - knowing full well that the grave misstep into which he had stumbled forced him to undergo this humiliation, obey the pope, and swallow an indignity all the more bitter because it was inflicted by a man whom he regarded as nothing less than a heretic. This time, however, he had to bend and suppress his rage, outwardly taking no offense at Pole's eloquent slight. Pole came down to receive him only after Carafa had made it clear that he was "weary of waiting so long" and about to leave.

The document conveys with striking effectiveness the subtle dialectical game between the two cardinals: the poisoned courtesies, insincere professions of friendship and loyalty, and insidious blackmail that punctuated the conversation.[30] Above all, however, one must grasp the skill with which Carafa transformed what had been an imposed gesture - a required act of reparation after the discovery of his inquisitorial plot - into a new and subtle aggression. It is difficult to believe that amid the "many affectionate words" exchanged by both men Pole was taken in by the hypocritical declaration that Carafa wished "to enjoy his Cardinal Pole for a while," by the obvious lies ("Naples went so far as to say that he had never spoken or written of him except in the most honorable terms, and had heard nothing alleged against him except his association with Flaminio"), or by the opportunistic reassurances ("the cardinal of Naples showed himself greatly consoled on hearing this about Flaminio" - namely, that the cardinal of England had received him into his household only to keep him within Catholic orthodoxy). Hence Pole's immediate refusal of the insidious invitation to "write something and let the world see it," as though it were now his task to justify himself:[31]

> "What, am I to write an apology? Let me see quis me accusat aut qua de re accusor." Naples replied that, for the love of God, he should not let such a word escape him, and that he would not for anything have the world even suspect that there was any thought of an apology, for he had Pole's honor too much at heart. Pole answered that he cared nothing for his honor, nor did he believe it would be stained by this; indeed, he would write in order to make the world judge of the calumnies brought against him, so that there was no need to worry about his honor. Perhaps one should worry about Naples's honor, because if one man spoke as he did, a hundred spoke as Pole did, and Pole erat sibi conscius of his own conscience, just as it was clear that he had never stained the friendship between them; Naples could consider whether he himself had done likewise, which many thought he had not. And returning to the question of writing, Pole said that he would not do it.

When the trap laid for his interlocutor failed, Carafa was ready to retreat. Pole's flash of irritation is revealing, briefly cracking the thin veneer of formal composure in a conversation bordering on the grotesque. Disconcerted by his visitor's unexpected aggressive thrust, it now fell to Pole to complain about "the manner employed" by the Holy Office, though he let slip an unrequested excuse - "even though he agrees with the end." This was the front on which Carafa was most exposed at that moment, after his misstep in Fra Bernardo's affair, and it is unsurprising that Pole counterattacked there. But his protest remained too general for the Theatine not to answer with declarations of principle that were destined to have no effect. It was difficult to believe Carafa when he said that he wished to retire and reside at Naples and that in future matters of the Holy Office he would follow not "the manner used by the inquisitors in Rome" - an astonishing

statement from his lips - "but the other way he mentioned, namely charity and gentleness, up to a certain point"; the last words alone were enough to belie this platonic declaration of intent. Nor did the cardinal of Naples hesitate to mention Giulia Gonzaga and subtly allude to suspicions against her, forcing his colleague to give an "account of the friendship he had" with the noblewoman. Pole in turn reproached him "that he had heard from other cardinals what Naples said about him; Naples replied that he should not trust cardinals."[32] Carafa's success in this skirmish becomes all the clearer when his initial position of weakness is considered, and it is therefore understandable that he ended the meeting "most contented and satisfied."

Supported by an overall project within which he could situate the contingent attitudes imposed by circumstance, the Theatine succeeded in transforming the failure of the first massive inquisitorial offensive against Pole and Morone into a temporary setback that took nothing from his medium- and long-term prospects, even if it deprived his arsenal of some evidence. The cardinal of England, by contrast, lacking any political strategy, was forced into a defensive posture, dissipating his moment of strength and the pope's support in the mere protection of his good name and conscience. The conclusion of the conversation was therefore predictable and perhaps had been foreseen and agreed in advance, although the hyperbolic professions of friendship recorded by Gheri cannot escape notice:[33]

> Naples apologized at length to Pole for these and other matters, swearing that he had always been his greatest friend and likewise promising and swearing that he would always remain so, calling God as witness and saying that he would be the most impious man in the world if he acted otherwise. Thus he left San Paolo showing himself wholly devoted to Cardinal Pole and most desirous at all times of doing him every honor and service. That same evening he related part of the conversation to his colleague in the Inquisition, adding that Cardinal Pole was the best and most blameless man alive, and that if God were to dispose otherwise of Pope Julius he would wish no other pope than Pole. He later said some of these things to others as well and wished them to be known, showing everyone that Pole lived most excellently and held the faith most soundly, and showing that whatever anyone said to the contrary was pure calumny and falsehood.

In reality, Carafa's recantation was foreordained and constituted the price he had to pay for his false step in the Bartoli affair. The pope's intervention obliged him to retreat and issue these resounding verbal certificates of Pole's orthodoxy, which allowed him to escape the corner into which he had been driven without admitting any responsibility and without the English cardinal obtaining anything. It cost him little to promise that, if both men lived long enough to attend another conclave, his interlocutor would see what that old man - he said, pointing to himself - would do for him.[34]

For the moment, certainly, the inquisitors had been blocked, but only Julius III's personal guarantee protected Pole and Morone from new threats. Meanwhile, as though nothing had happened and in contradiction of his promises, the Theatine continued straight along his path, secretly accumulating evidence and documents against his adversaries. It was during Julius III's pontificate, in fact, that the Burgundian penitentiary Gabriel Martenet delivered to the Roman Holy Office the abjuration of a former Spanish Dominican who, among his many accomplices, listed Pole first, calling him the head of an angelic school - with a play on angelica and anglica - a conventicle, or sectam, of heretics and suspects, followed by Renée of France, Morone, Ascanio and Vittoria Colonna, Flaminio, Carnesecchi, Priuli, and others.[35] It was precisely the day after the conversation at San Paolo, on 1 June 1553, that Reginaldo Nerli drew up under oath at the Roman convent of the Minerva a short memorandum recalling his relations with the Milanese cardinal.[36] In the same month, although Carafa had just declared himself "most consoled" by Pole's answers in the Flaminio affair, the supreme inquisitors in Rome claimed certainty that Flaminio had "held most depraved views" in matters of religion, to such an extent that it was said "that both his writings [...] and his name and memory will be condemned forever, and his bones exhumed and burned and the ashes scattered to the wind."[37] Then in November it was Don Lorenzo Davidico's turn to go to Rome and report to the cardinal of Carpi his spiteful accusations against Morone.[38]

2. A Precarious Truce: Girolamo Muzzarelli and the Dominican Order

The importance of Muzzarelli's role in the troubled events reconstructed above is confirmed by the long letter Pole wrote to him on 9 August 1553, while at Maguzzano awaiting the resumption of his journey to England, to thank him for defending his good name.[39]

It was the master of the Sacred Palace who had informed him that, on the day after the conversation at San Paolo, Carafa had invited him to dinner to reaffirm his esteem for the English cardinal, attributing the recent dissension to malicious rumors. Now, in his wish to minimize what had happened, the Theatine was using Muzzarelli as a mediator to let Pole know how much he had appreciated their meeting at San Paolo fuori le Mura, but also to request a copy of his book against Henry VIII and to induce him to publish this and other works. In his reply, the cardinal of England expressed satisfaction at the reconciliation, though he raised some doubts about Carafa's sincerity, attributing to divine providence the ability to accomplish in one hour what certain mutual friends had failed to achieve. Meanwhile, however, the calumnies continued to circulate without his being able to refute them, and the Roman inquisitors did not cease to give ear to every infamy, beginning with the recently deceased commissioner general Teofilo Scullica, who had spared neither Contarini, Morone, nor Pole himself from accusation.[40] At the end of the letter Pole finally acknowledged that many found the astonishing reconciliation hard to believe and even attributed his own belief in it to naivety, while making no secret of their perplexity at Carafa's public demonstrations of esteem and affection, too ardent, sudden, and ostentatious to be sincere. In any case, after what had happened, it was for Carafa to convince the unbelievers, and he would certainly not lack the means to do so.[41] After so many fine words, in other words, the time had come for deeds.

In his reply of 1 September 1553, Muzzarelli insisted that the cardinal of England should publish his writings on faith, the Church, the clergy, and clerical morals, though he failed to overcome Pole's reservations. Even if it is impossible to know how far he himself believed those thunderous expressions of affection, the master of the Sacred Palace reassured Pole of Julius III's constant protection, for the pope had always defended him with great wisdom and affection, while Carafa too seemed to know no limit in praising his virtues.[42] For the moment, then, the inquisitorial machinery had been stopped. Pole's return to the British Isles, where his commitment to the Catholic restoration and his very distance would spare him further encounters and clashes with his adversary, helped calm the troubled waters of the Curia. As for Morone, the retraction wrested from Bartoli seemed to close the case. Indeed, the pope chose Morone himself - whose advice on English affairs he had hitherto sought[43] - to follow his friend's difficult mission from Rome as vice-protector of England. Morone performed the task so well as to earn the praise of Juan Manrique de Lara, who judged him capable of acting with greater authority and prudence than any other cardinal.[44] On 31 December 1553 Manrique wrote to Charles V in terms of high praise for Morone, who was always ready to accommodate Habsburg requests and was so discreet that full confidence could be placed in him.[45]

Yet this assignment did not please the Milanese cardinal, who wrote to Pole about it in anxious and allusive terms in which echoes of the Bartoli affair can be discerned. "I would not have wished," he said on 28 February 1554, "that in ordinary matters the pope had given me the regular charge of writing to you on his behalf; and this, besides other considerations, so that the officials of the palace should not become suspicious and perform malicious offices."[46] The frequent expressions of fraternal friendship in the correspondence between the two cardinals reveal their awareness of the difficult situation they shared.[47] Hence Morone's praise for the prudence Pole displayed in the delicate question of ecclesiastical property secularized by Henry VIII, which in his view was useful "to stop the mouth of anyone here who might wish to malign him." Nor is it surprising that he felt "great envy" for his colleague, far from Roman intrigues; still less, after the election of Paul IV, that he wished "to be a Carthusian or a Camaldolese, or to be in England."[48] For the same reason he was quick to see the positive implications of Vergerio's attacks on Pole for the persecutions inflicted on the English reformers.[49]

A final note is warranted on the personal story of Girolamo Muzzarelli, who would later pay the price for the responsibility he had assumed in making himself Julius III's instrument: forcing the Holy Office to adopt milder counsels, inducing Fra Bernardo to retract, defending the spirituali, and laboring for the chimerical

reconciliation between Pole and Carafa, in whose success he may have been the only person to believe. Rewarded - and at the same time removed from the Holy Office - with the archbishopric of Conza at the end of 1553, he was sent as nuncio to the emperor, as Morone informed Pole on 21 December with understandable satisfaction: "He is certainly a good man and of great prudence."[50] Muzzarelli remained in Brussels until September 1556, seeking to facilitate the English cardinal's mission, on whose behalf he warmly supported, among other things, a petition addressed to Julius III by Donato Rullo and several of his relatives asking to be absolved from the charge of having been "partisans of justification, the merit of works, and the consequences thereof."[51] After Paul IV's election, however, his relations with Rome deteriorated rapidly, not only because of the new pope's bellicose anti-imperial policy but also because old resentments over his role during Julius III's pontificate resurfaced. More than once he expressed deep hostility toward Pope Carafa and his overbearing nephews, so much so that the Florentine ambassador could inform Cosimo de' Medici that the nuncio had often complained to him of "the tyranny of his master."[52] As early as 3 October 1555 Muzzarelli warned Morone of "the suspicions, distrust, and terrible reports current at these courts because of Rome's actions," as well as "the labors and disturbances" he had suffered in trying to calm the pope's anti-Habsburg fury.[53] On 13 November, "setting aside every worldly consideration," he guaranteed the emperor's desire for peace to the pope and voiced veiled criticisms of the cardinal-nephew Carlo Carafa.[54] It was most probably in those weeks, as the future Cardinal Zaccaria Dolfin would later report to the Holy Office, that during a dinner with numerous cardinals Paul IV once again railed against "the princes of the house of Austria as heretics; and when Cardinal Morone spoke a word, namely that His Majesty was of pious mind, the pope turned upon His Most Reverend Lordship with words and gestures as though he wanted to eat him alive."[55]

The nuncio's position in Brussels soon became untenable, reduced as he was to a mere façade for a nonexistent will to peace, while the Carafa and their friends did not hesitate to bestow on him epithets such as "notorious scoundrel" and "pig of a friar."[56] At last he could bear no more. On 10 August 1556, four days before the pope signed the curt brief recalling him from the nunciature, he addressed a letter to Scipione Rebiba, a staunch loyalist of Paul IV who had just been made a cardinal and sent to replace him, denouncing a situation that had become intolerable. He was far from intending to question "the rectitude, integrity, zeal for peace, and most holy piety" of the pontiff, but Rome's conduct justified the belief that "so many and such serious disorders arise from rash, partisan, and perhaps scarcely Christian ministers." All his warnings had been useless, and now, setting aside every caution and restraint, the nuncio felt bound to speak his mind plainly, with allusions to Carlo Carafa that were only too clear, even though he still tried to lay responsibility for all those disasters on him alone: "I cannot endure that diabolical ministers should throw the world, religion, and an already grievously afflicted Christendom into confusion, while His Beatitude is of so pious and holy a mind and these Majesties wish to be toward him as obedient and devoted as God commands them."[57]

On returning to Rome, however, that uncompromising Dominican soon realized that he had been mistaken in drawing this charitable distinction between the pope and his ministers. Instead of seeing a brilliant ecclesiastical career crowned by the cardinalate, he had to endure bitter humiliations and retire to his small diocese of Conza, dying in 1561 at Salerno as the guest of Girolamo Seripando. Pope Carafa made him pay not only for the favorable testimony he gave Morone in May 1558 and for the dignified interventions by which he had tried to recall the cardinal-nephew to a life more consonant with his rank, but also for the role he had played in 1551-53 on Julius III's behalf, his interference in the affairs of the Holy Office, and his mediation with Pole in the grotesque comedy of the meeting at San Paolo. Summoned to testify in the trial of Carlo Carafa in June 1560, Muzzarelli himself would bitterly recall that dark period of suspicion and revenge, pronouncing a terrible epitaph on Paul IV's pontificate:[58]

> For this reason and for many others, because I wrote to him [Carlo Carafa] with the greatest sincerity - perhaps contrary to his designs - for the benefit of all Christendom and even of his own household, I know that he contrived to have me removed from that nunciature, and they artfully framed the brief of recall in such terms that they thought I would not dare appear in Rome. The other insults and persecutions inflicted upon me are manifest, and I think little of them, having the testimony of my most sincere conscience. I wish

> that I alone, who am a worm of the earth, had been caught in the midst of them, and not religion, the faith, the authority of that Holy See, and all Christianity. May God forgive all those who have forcibly brought about so many ruins; in this matter there is an infinite sea.

Muzzarelli was not the only Dominican to side with the pope in the trial of strength with the Holy Office, for many of his fellow friars were involved in Fra Bernardo's case, although they acted on opposing fronts. On one side were those who identified themselves with the leaders of the Holy Office - Cardinal Juan Álvarez de Toledo and the commissioners general Teofilo Scullica and Michele Ghislieri; on the other were those who supported the pope's attempt to curb its intrusiveness, such as Muzzarelli and the vicar of the order, Stefano Usodimare. Personally involved and divided in their positions over the thorny Bartoli affair, the Friars Preachers revealed internal disagreements and conflicts, as was only to be expected when the clash between Julius III and the Holy Office reached its height and a choice had to be made as to which side to take, which loyalty to privilege, and which rules to obey. It was undoubtedly a difficult choice for the inquisitorial order par excellence, whose leaders nevertheless largely wished to distance themselves from Carafa's strategies. This is shown by the fact that when a stroke carried off the master general Francesco Romeo da Castiglione on 20 July 1552, a few weeks after Fra Bernardo's abjuration,[59] it was Usodimare who succeeded him as master general. And when the cardinal protector Giovanni Salviati died on 28 October 1553, Julius III appointed Morone in his place,[60] giving him a role that allowed him to intervene in the order's internal affairs, maintain direct relations with its leaders and influence its direction, and acquire the prestige and certificate of orthodoxy that came with the office.

The fact that the brief of appointment was not issued until six months later, on 18 April 1554, nevertheless shows that the choice provoked considerable opposition. In January 1560 the master general Vincenzo Giustiniani would recall that, as soon as he heard of Salviati's death, he had immediately informed his predecessor Usodimare, who named "three cardinals, the first of whom was the Most Reverend Morone." Giustiniani communicated the names to Julius III, who agreed on Morone, "praising him more than the others," although he asked how they would deal with Cardinal Álvarez de Toledo, who aspired to the office. Giustiniani replied that the Dominicans did not intend to oppose the wishes of so illustrious a confrere, but believed that precisely because he was one of them he could hardly refuse to protect the order in any case, whereas the appointment of the Milanese cardinal would allow them "to have the favor of an additional patron." The Spaniard, however - certainly not out of pride or ambition alone - refused to accept that choice and insisted on being appointed himself, "and thus for the time being the matter did not proceed in favor of Monsignor Morone." Only later did his very poor health and the pressure of his nephew Tomás Manrique, procurator general of the order, induce Álvarez to accept the Milanese cardinal's appointment, "praising the man without making any exception or reply in opposition," as Giustiniani later declared in an effort to present an atmosphere of edifying concord: "And the order remained most satisfied and content with the protection of the said Most Reverend Morone and with the good works he performed."[61] Morone's successor in the diocese of Modena, Egidio Foscarari, would say that Usodimare had informed him of the affair and that the order had never had a protector so loved and obeyed. Another Dominican, Giovan Battista Spiritello, who had once preached in the Emilian city, would assert that "everyone was exceedingly pleased with that appointment, proclaiming his goodness," while adding that "if he had not been held to be a Catholic [...] he would not have been called," because in matters of orthodoxy those friars "would spare no one whatsoever!"[62]

It was therefore the inquisitor-cardinal Juan Álvarez de Toledo, vice-protector of the Dominicans from 1541 until his death in 1557, who led the opposition to Morone. Yet he found himself opposed not only to Julius III's will but also to the leaders of the order, who sided with his rival, before themselves rallying fully to the Carafan position a few years later. The delay in issuing the brief of appointment thus reveals the outbreak of yet another conflict between the pontiff and the Holy Office, with the Milanese cardinal once more at the center of the storm. These were the same years in which a clear split also emerged in Spain between the Suprema and important sectors of the Dominican order. Through authoritative friars such as Domingo de Soto and Francisco and Diego de Vitoria, the latter affirmed the full legitimacy of correctio

fraterna even in cases of heresy, opposed the inquisitors' claims to impose their jurisdictional monopoly, sought to exclude them from academic debate, and defended freedom of theological reflection.[63]

Several contemporary episodes reveal further reflections of this conflict. Other inquisitors noted for particular moderation also point back to the cultural and religious life of the Dominican Studium in Bologna,[64] among them Leandro Alberti, a learned Bolognese theologian, humanist, and geographer, jokingly described by Giovio in 1543 as a "surly inquisitor, greedy for roast human flesh,"[65] but regarded by others as a "wise inquisitor." Besides benevolently absolving numerous suspects and confessed heterodox believers, Alberti tore up letters from his friend Marcantonio Flaminio praising Ochino and the Benefit of Christ that Don Niccolò Bargellesi had delivered to him, and criticized abuses in the Roman court to the point of attributing Luther's "errors" to "the indiscreet superstition of many religious" and "the greedy voracity of certain clerics."[66] When in 1551 the Marchigian priest Pietro Manelfi appeared before him after active Anabaptist and anti-Trinitarian militancy, declaring himself repentant and desirous of returning to the bosom of the Church, Alberti merely listened to his sensational confession, which listed city by city and name by name the hundreds of heretics Manelfi had known and frequented in the past, including several persons of rank. He then sent him at once to Rome, but directed him not to the Holy Office, rather to his friend, confrere, and fellow citizen Girolamo Muzzarelli, who had become master of the Sacred Palace.[67]

Similar attitudes were displayed by other Bolognese inquisitors, such as Tommaso Maria Beccadelli, who in 1544 collaborated with Morone in preparing the text of Bartolomeo della Pergola's retraction,[68] and Girolamo Papino, a Lombard with a "bold mind" and a cutting tongue, who had studied in Bologna and whose disenchanted judgment on the council's work during the Bolognese phase has already been recalled. The accusation that he had maintained "that simple fornication was not a mortal sin," and the suspicion with which some confreres regarded him, holding him "in the worst odor," obstructed his appointment as inquisitor of Ferrara desired by Ercole II, who finally secured it in October 1548.[69] In the exercise of that office, moreover, Papino seemed to act more as the Este duke's trusted agent in protecting the court and city from the suspicions aroused by the duchess's avowed Calvinist heresy than as

a delegate of the Holy Office in the struggle against the enemies of the faith. It is no coincidence that in February 1557, on hearing of Papino's death, the duke immediately took care to have "all the writings that deal with Lutheran matters" seized, and above all the lost Libro grande of the heresiarch Giorgio Siculo, whose doctrines Papino had regarded with interest, to the point of approving for publication in early October 1550 his Epistola alli cittadini di Riva di Trento, a genuine apology for the most radical Nicodemism.[70] It cannot be excluded that Papino himself ordered Siculo's physical elimination after pronouncing sentence upon him in 1551, perhaps to prevent the sensational revelations that the Sicilian Benedictine might have made.[71] With the shadowy profile of a heretic concealed beneath the robes of an inquisitor, he too belongs among the succession of Dominicans who headed the Holy Office in Bologna, some of whom in different ways and capacities stood beside Pope Julius III in his attempt to curb the intrusiveness of the Holy Office.

To these must be added Reginaldo Nerli, formerly Morone's collaborator in the pastoral government of Modena,[72] whom the cardinal repeatedly invited to dine together with Fra Leandro during the Bolognese legation. On 1 June 1553, at the Roman convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, "constrained by his superiors and by zeal for the most holy faith," Nerli drew up a short memorandum concerning the Milanese cardinal, one that must have disappointed the inquisitors who requested it and appeared suspiciously reticent to them. Closely attached to Morone through moral rigor and shared reforming concerns, Nerli took part as a theologian in the Bolognese phase of the council. Although far removed from Papino's unscrupulousness, he divided the work with him when in 1550 he granted permission to print Siculo's Espositione [...] nel nono decimo et undecimo capo della Epistola di san Paolo alli romani. The following year he obtained the master's degree in theology and then the regency of the Studium, before being appointed inquisitor of Bologna on 1 May 1552. He held the office until 1554, when he was abruptly replaced by his confrere Eustachio Locatelli. It was in fact a genuine removal from office, which he reported to Morone on 30 May 1554, begging him above all to "preserve in me the honor of Our Lord God, which is now in great danger, since I am held not

only here but in Ferrara and elsewhere to be an enemy of the most holy faith and, as such, most deservedly deprived of the Inquisition," venting his bitterness over the way he had been treated.[73]

From these scattered notices emerges the profile of a group of Dominicans raised together in the great Bolognese convent, whose church housed the relics of the holy founder and whose Studium taught the most promising young men the subtleties of Thomistic doctrine and the ability to adapt them to a turbulent present. Within those walls Foscarari, Muzzarelli, Beccadelli, Nerli, and Papino became theologians of substantial learning and developed common orientations that they would later carry into the important offices entrusted to them. Beside them may also be mentioned Stefano Usodimare, who likewise lived for a time at San Domenico, and another illustrious confrere educated in Bologna, the highly learned Modenese Pietro Bertano, connected with Ercole Gonzaga, whose support enabled him to become bishop of Fano and cardinal - "the most accomplished and resolute mind I have ever known in my life, [...] a most exceptional man," in Cardinal Madruzzo's judgment in 1546[74] - though he too was reputed a heretic and was placed on trial by Paul IV. Less than a year earlier Alessandro Farnese had thought of him as a possible successor to Morone in the diocese of Modena, since he was "a man capable of recognizing the sickness of those people and curing it."[75]

Often roughly of the same age, students and sometimes professors in the Bolognese Studium, all of them dealt in one capacity or another with heretics and heresy - as masters of the Sacred Palace, bishops, vicars general of the order, or inquisitors - and all brought to that extremely delicate task a spirit of moderation, a desire to understand the reasons of the heretics, readiness to compromise, and attention to political requirements. They were, in short, schoolmates whose shared religious and political outlook pointed back to the generation that had preceded them in those classrooms and then occupied their chairs, to their teachers born in the 1470s. Among them, besides the already mentioned Leandro Alberti, an important role was undoubtedly played by Egidio Foscarari's uncle Stefano, several times prior of San Domenico and inquisitor of Bologna from 1526 to 1543, and by his successor Tommaso Maria Beccadelli. In 1547 Papino inherited from Beccadelli the office of regent of the Studium, and in 1548 Muzzarelli succeeded him as inquisitor of Bologna. The following generation appears much more solidly aligned with militant inquisitorial positions, beginning with Eustachio Locatelli, together with Michele Ghislieri and the two commissioners general of the Holy Office called to succeed him, the men of Vigevano Tommaso Scotti and Arcangelo Bianchi, later made a cardinal, as well as friars of the Tuscan-Roman province such as Matteo Lachi, Paolino Bernardini, and many others, some of them formed in Savonarolan circles and eager to disprove every heretical implication by displaying impeccable anti-Lutheran zeal.[76]

3. Barnabites and Jesuits

The Dominicans were not, however, the only old or new religious order to experience inquisitorial pressure. In 1551-52 an extensive repression also struck the Cassinese Benedictines, among whom Siculo had many followers,[77] while a dramatic internal crisis threatened the very survival of the Barnabites and their female branch, the Angelics,[78] further proof of the cyclone that then seemed to sweep through the upper reaches of the Church. Their relations with Morone make it useful to pause briefly over the latter.

As early as 20 August 1550, from Venice, Nuncio Beccadelli urged Rome to have the Holy Office intervene against the small group of clerics of San Paolo Decollato who had settled in the lagoon city. They had quickly aroused the suspicions of the Council of Ten, concerned by reports of the unacceptable dominion exercised by the "divine mother and mistress" Paola Antonia Negri over those foreign priests, by their proselytism among the patriciate, and by the unscrupulous use they made of confession to win the allegiance of women. Yet after the decree of 19 February 1551 expelling them from Venetian territories, the initiative was taken not by the supreme inquisitors but by the Barnabites themselves, utterly unaware of the blind alley into which they were walking. When Gian Pietro Besozzi and Paolo Melso went to Rome in December of that year to protest against the calumnies they believed were persecuting them, they were thunderstruck to be arrested under the congregation's decree of 29 December,[79] and even taken in chains to prison, from which they would not emerge until August. Letters sent by their procurator in Rome, Matteo Daverio, to two

noblewomen close to the Milanese clerics - the countess of Guastalla, Ludovica Torelli, and Ferrante Gonzaga's wife, Isabella Di Capua - allow us to follow a trial that concerned not only Negri's conduct and the grave disciplinary irregularities of her followers, but above all the radical spiritualism of their master Fra Battista da Crema. For this reason too the case was closely followed by the leaders of the Roman Holy Office, who entrusted the interrogations of the two unfortunate Barnabites to Fra Michele Ghislieri[80] and, after sentence was passed, sent a visitor to Milan to impose order on those badly governed clerics, who had been incapable of seeing the abyss into which they had fallen.[81]

Elena Bonora has shown how this affair too formed part of the bitter conflict then under way at the summit of the Church, with the opening of the secret trials against Pole and Morone.[82] It should be emphasized that Daverio's privileged interlocutor was Muzzarelli, whom he went to see, for example, on 12 March 1552, in pouring rain, meeting him as he was getting into his carriage "to go and examine the patriarch of Aquileia."[83] It should not be forgotten that in those weeks the master of the Sacred Palace also had to deal with Pietro Antonio Di Capua's cardinalate and Bernardo Bartoli's retraction. Daverio himself quickly understood that the best way to help the Milanese Barnabites was not to submit memorials to eminent cardinals, to exert himself so that the pope might be informed "of the malice of the said inquisitors," or to knock on the doors of the powerful in Rome or Milan in search of audiences, recommendations, and favors. It was the Holy Office that led the dance, looking no one in the face and listening to no one's opinion, because its leaders, he wrote, "do not proceed according to the terms of reason and wish to be right in every case." On 24 March he reported another meeting with Muzzarelli, from whom he had learned that in the Barnabites' case "some things had emerged that displeased him, because they were such as to disturb the said Most Reverend Lords" - for example, Melso's protest at having been examined "with great subtlety," or his obstinate defense "of certain articles of Fra Battista's doctrine that were condemned." The master of the Sacred Palace explained that Melso would have done well to retract them, because in no circumstances was it permissible to question the procedures and judgments of the inquisitors.[84]

There is no need to dwell further on the Barnabites' affairs. Their trial ended with the return of Besozzi and Melso to Milan and with a radical reform imposed by Rome to normalize that small and undisciplined religious community, which came close to dissolution because of the deep divisions that appeared within it after the condemnation of Battista da Crema and Negri's confinement in a convent. In any case, even for those Milanese clerics entrenched in devotion to the "divine mother and mistress" and in penitential frenzy, the principal accusations concerned not their conduct but their doctrines, with the disturbing specter of Fra Battista, who had aroused Carafa's distrust since the 1530s.[85] The drafting of a Censura articulorum extractorum ex libellis quondam fratris Baptistae de Crema, beginning with the judgment of Ambrogio Catarino Politi and the Jesuits, undoubtedly dates from those months; its condemnation in the Index would follow.[86] "Here they are burning Crema's books, but see that it is done without causing offense," Loyola took care to write to Jean Pelletier on 22 October 1552, with his usual prudence.[87] Though they came from very different spiritual experiences and possessed very different forms of organization, the Jesuits too were a recently founded order and were not without ties to the Barnabites, as is also shown by the fact that during the trial Besozzi was confined for a time in Saint Ignatius's house. Loyola, so far as can be understood, played a role in the affair that was not free of ambiguity.

By contrast, relations between the Society and the Theatines were - and would remain - extremely poor, beginning with the anything but friendly relationship between Loyola and Carafa. The latter's descent from a great Neapolitan house steeped in anti-Habsburg hatred led him to detest anything with even the faintest scent of Spain. Moreover, his uncompromising dedication to the struggle against heresy made him distrust that former soldier who had repeatedly come under inquisitorial scrutiny, accused of alumbradismo, and who nevertheless managed within a few years to achieve extraordinary successes and even obtain from Julius III inadmissible privileges regarding the absolution of heretics.[88] Nor can Carafa have failed to notice the good relations of the first Jesuits, beginning with Bobadilla, with Pole and Contarini, who in 1540 had supported Paul III's recognition of the order, or the distinctive strategies they pursued toward heretics with Pope Del Monte's support. Some years later Nadal would say that he did not know the reasons for Carafa's hostility to

Ignatius's Society,[89] which arose above all from suspicions of that anomalous congregation of regular clerics, a rival to his Theatines. Those suspicions were nourished chiefly by the Dominicans, first among them Melchor Cano, author of a fiercely hostile Censura y parecer que dió contra el instituto de los padres jesuitas,[90] in which he accused them of defending the doctrines of the alumbrados, preaching certainty of grace, and being forerunners of Antichrist.

The University of Salamanca published the decree of the Faculty of Paris against the Society, which in May 1542 someone described as a group of Theatines who had fled Spain to escape the Inquisition pursuing them for alumbradismo.[91] Toward the end of the 1540s Fra Teofilo Scullica drafted a vitriolic denunciation of the Jesuits in which he invoked the trials suffered by the founder, denounced as a "Lutheran" and held responsible, together with his companions, for every kind of "wickedness, disclosure of confessions, and other [...] heretical behavior," as well as sodomitical practices with boys dressed and made up as women whom they housed. "He could be burned alive," Scullica concluded, adding that some went so far as to say that "if God allows such great wickedness to multiply in the Church of God, I shall believe that on the day of judgment the devil will be saved with all the damned."[92] In Spain in 1553 the Spiritual Exercises were likewise accused of alumbrado heresy by a commission of theologians chaired by the Dominican Tomás Pedroche.[93] On the other hand, in a letter addressed to Carafa in 1536 Saint Ignatius had criticized the luxury of his lifestyle and raised objections to the practices of the Theatines, who lacked the means to live, did not preach, and did not devote themselves to works of mercy.[94] According to his first biographers, in 1537 he did not move from Venice to Rome with his first companions also "because of [...] the new Theatine cardinal," and in 1555, on hearing of the latter's election to the papacy, all the bones in his body were said to have turned over.[95]

Morone's favor toward the Jesuits was expressed above all in a Roman and centralizing perspective, in his intention "continually to benefit this venerable Society of Jesus," as he would write to Beccadelli on 10 August 1560,[96] just as the Jesuits found in him a valuable interlocutor, according to the principle enunciated by Ignatius's and the Society's secretary, Juan Alfonso de Polanco, who in the late 1540s held that it was always necessary to maintain the favor of the pope, the most authoritative prelates, and other powerful figures of the Curia.[97] As confirmation of Morone's wholly Roman view of the Jesuits' role as a bulwark of the Catholic Church against the Protestant threat on one side and the Holy Office's seizure of power on the other, it may be noted that he played no significant role in establishing the Jesuits in Milan,[98] Novara, or Modena, where the college he initially supported immediately encountered difficulties.

As early as December 1551 Ignatius supported the Modenese initiative by writing directly to Foscarari, to whom the Jesuits considered themselves "especially indebted" from the time when he had been master of the Sacred Palace, not least because of his defense of the Spiritual Exercises. The bishop's "great willingness" regarding the establishment of a college at Modena seemed to enjoy broad support among the citizens, who "do not hold back."[99] According to Polanco, however, Foscarari could do little because Morone had reserved a large part of the bishopric's revenue for himself,[100] and the Modenese "little college" therefore struggled to get started because of shortages and obstacles that are nevertheless difficult to decipher.[101] In the confessio written immediately after his arrest Morone would recall having tried to remedy the mistake committed in expelling Salmerón in 1543 by donating fifty gold scudi each year to the Jesuit college founded in 1552 "for the service of God and to aid those souls and to show that city that I approve the doctrine of this Society."[102] At first, however, his contribution was planned for only four years, after which he seemed inclined to suspend payment, although on 21 November 1556 he wrote to a Modenese citizen of firm Catholic faith, Giovanni Castelvetro, that he remained convinced of the initiative's merit, inspired by his desire that in his beloved Modena "there should be good ministers who uproot the evil that is there and plant what is good."[103] It is therefore likely that considerations of expediency and pressure to continue the initiative induced him to reverse his decision.[104] Yet a few weeks before his death, in a letter to the rector of the Modenese college, Loyola observed that "they are not collecting Cardinal Morone's fifty scudi," and that "perhaps it will be well to say nothing until the matter is raised on his side," though in another letter he expressed confidence that the former bishop of the city would not suspend his financial support "because he is very much our patron."[105]

All this seems to confirm that the political and religious horizon within which Morone situated his relations with the Society of Jesus was above all Roman: both because it concerned first of all the relationship with the papacy and the defense of the Church, and because the Jesuit educational institutions he promoted were those established in the Urbs. To look more deeply, sixteenth-century Jesuit sources offer little, often conditioned by guarded reticence. The connections established between Saint Ignatius's first disciples and the spirituali are

therefore difficult to investigate and have often been ignored by a historiography still reluctant to recall the Jesuits' original identity in the context of the sixteenth-century religious crisis, which saw them moving among Erasmian and alumbrado Spain, Fabrist France, and Valdesian Italy.[106] It is hardly surprising, moreover, that the numerous inquisitorial proceedings endured by Loyola, his own converso roots, and his biography as a former Basque soldier - scarcely exemplary from a religious and moral standpoint - quickly aroused the suspicions of Carafa's entourage, suspicions aggravated by Ignatius's refusal in 1545 to merge the Jesuits with the Theatines.[107] To these factors must be added the peculiarities of the rule, which provoked many doubts about the distinctive features of the new institute: the absence of a common habit and of choral recitation of the breviary, expressions of implicit anti-monasticism dangerously close to the ideas of Luther and Erasmus; strict hierarchical centralism; a superior general appointed for life; the great mobility of its members and insistence on itinerant and unpaid apostolate conducted in poverty; the presentation of itself as an alternative, if not an opponent, to the mendicant orders; the fourth vow of obedience to the pope, seemingly designed to counterbalance the suspicions and charges of subversion that had afflicted the Society from its foundation; the distinctive forma vitae, which excluded, among other things, obligatory corporal penances; the use of the controversial Spiritual Exercises; and the myth of the primitive Church centered on cryptic modes of speaking and acting that were never explicitly defined.[108]

These doubts were overcome only through Contarini's patience and authority. In 1538 he made the Spiritual Exercises under Loyola's guidance, and the following year he sponsored the Society's approval by Paul III. The order was also initially supported by Pole, whose relations with the Ignatians later cooled,[109] and by Vittoria Colonna, who appreciated the preaching of the Jesuits Rodríguez and Le Jay at Ferrara and supported Ignatius's fellowship in various ways.[110] Morone's role in promoting the Society among the curial hierarchies and in facilitating its participation in important political and religious events, from the religious colloquies of 1540-41 to the final phase of the Council of Trent, was also far from negligible. From the outset he was held in high esteem by Saint Ignatius's followers,[111] although it is difficult to assess precisely the character and limits of his contribution, since the elusive identity of the first Jesuits and the polysemy of their language were compounded by changes over time in their relationship with him. These were naturally conditioned by the cardinal's need - no less pressing than that of the Society - to recover an image of orthodoxy after his inquisitorial trial. Like other new religious orders that arose in the first half of the sixteenth century, such as the Barnabites and Capuchins, the Jesuits too had to experience the harshness of the Holy Office, nearly being overwhelmed by it or forced to censor themselves in order to survive, especially during Pope Carafa's pontificate, which soon unleashed the war against "Jesuit difference" that his successors drawn from inquisitorial ranks would continue into the seventeenth century.[112]

The Society's ambivalent relations with the Apostolic See could thus oscillate between the broad favors granted by Paul III, who in 1540 approved the Ignatians' Deliberationes and extended to them privileges enjoyed by ancient and prestigious religious orders, and the hostility of Paul IV, who attempted to abolish two pillars of the congregation: the absence of choir and the life tenure of the superior general.[113] This bipolarity affected the relationship between the order and Morone, animated on one side by shared intentions of pastoral renewal and moderation toward religious dissent, and on the other compromised by the need of both to redefine their political and religious image as the first shadows of the Counter-Reformation emerged. Hence the "clouds" that darkened relations between the Jesuits and other pro-imperial members of the Sacred College, including Ercole Gonzaga.[114] Jesuit sources say little or nothing about the Milanese cardinal's imprisonment and trial, although he was their benefactor,[115] and although Salmerón gave decisive testimony

when recounting his expulsion from Modena in 1543,[116] only later, together with other Jesuits, to plead Morone's cause at the court of Philip II.[117]

It cannot be excluded that the overlapping inquisitorial initiatives of 1551-52 contributed to the Jesuits' decision, taken precisely then, abruptly to suspend the internal discussion - begun as early as 1550 - on the constitutions of the order. These contained provisions intended to sanction the Society's esoteric and centralizing characteristics, which for the time being it seemed prudent to consign to more confidential Declarations intended for internal circulation alone.[118] The reasons for the postponement remain largely obscure, although it may be supposed that the need to avoid suspicion or intrusion by the Holy Office was not foreign to it. Something similar happened to another young religious order that Carafa had regarded with suspicion from its origins,[119] the Capuchins, over whom the shadow of Ochino's flight to Geneva continued to hang. Many changes were proposed for the order's new constitutions, published in 1552, beginning with the removal of certain precepts marked by a pauperistic spirit - such as the possibility "of leading an eremitical life," or the rule according to which "he who cannot read Christ, the book of life, has no learning with which to preach," with the consequent prohibition "that preachers should not carry many books, since in Christ everything is found."[120] Also removed from the 1552 constitutions, but reintroduced in those of 1575 - confirmation of the political and religious emergency in which the former had been promulgated - were the rule requiring mercy toward friars who sinned, evidently suspected of permitting overly benevolent absolution in matters of faith, and the concluding prayer addressed to Christ, in whom "are our merits, examples of living, aids, favors, and rewards."[121] Here too it is not difficult to discern the anxieties, doubts, and fears unleashed by the activism of the Roman Holy Office and the resulting decision to erase from the constitutions every reference to the undisciplined eremitism of Matteo da Bascio or Ludovico da Fossombrone, and still more to the doctrine of justification by faith preached by the order's minister general after he became an apostate and heresiarch in Reformed lands.

4. The Roman College

If the rapid political and religious changes of the 1550s disillusioned Morone about the possibility of making the Society a bulwark of a reform of the Roman Church opposed to that promoted by inquisitors and Theatines, the 1560s and 1570s saw the continuation of his support for the pedagogical project that from mid-century began to characterize the Society's work. He must have regarded that reforming approach as effective in remedying the inadequacies of the clergy and consonant with his own cultural and pastoral sensibility, probably also because it was founded on the development of the individual qualities of the pupil rather than on the prestige of the teacher, an approach Loyola had experienced at the Sorbonne. This method would later be codified in the Ratio studiorum published at the end of the century.[122] The special attention devoted to founding educational institutions reveals the Society's humanistic sensibility - and perhaps the Erasmian component of its origins - which produced a constant concern that curricula should promote intellectual formation rather than the accumulation of information. This enabled the colleges to meet above all the educational needs of the upper classes, as shown by the foundation in Bologna in 1555 of the first collegium nobilium on the models of Vienna and Cologne, without betraying Ignatius's principle that the less wealthy should not be discriminated against and that access should not formally be denied them.[123] Morone's appreciation of the Society's educational vocation gave rise to his commitment to promoting the establishment of the prestigious Roman colleges.

In reality, contrary to what is sometimes believed, teaching was not among the original ministries of the Jesuit order. The decision to devote itself predominantly to education resulted from the need, increasingly clear to the Society's leaders in the 1530s and 1540s, to improve the training of religious in the face of the decay of schools for the formation of the clergy. After a beginning limited to the instruction of their own members, growing requests from lay elites induced the Ignatians to open the colleges to outsiders. The institutions of Gandía in Spain and Padua, opened in 1542 and intended for Jesuits studying at the local university, were followed by the first true college, inaugurated at Messina in 1548 and promoted by Leonora Osorio de Vega, wife of the viceroy Juan de Vega. The numerical growth of these institutions did not occur

without difficulty: even in the 1550s the foundation of several colleges remained on paper or was postponed for lack of funds, although various civic institutions requested their opening and testamentary bequests for the purpose were not lacking. Between 1548 and 1556 twenty-three colleges were founded in the peninsula, unevenly distributed: no fewer than seven in Rome, established between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries - the Roman, German, English, Maronite, Greek, Scottish, and Iberian Colleges - three in Bologna - Santa Lucia, San Francesco Saverio, and San Luigi Gonzaga - and three in Naples - the Collegio Massimo al Gesù, San Francesco Saverio, and San Giuseppe a Chiaia. Loreto housed two, thanks in part to Morone's efforts,[124] as did Messina, Milan, Palermo, Parma, and Sassari.[125] At Loyola's death in 1556 the Society had a thousand members, of whom only thirty-eight were professed of the highest grade.[126] Houses, schools, colleges, and seminaries thus increased the numerical and qualitative strength as well as the social and political influence of an order that was beginning to compete with older and more deeply rooted religious bodies.

Julius III supported the creation in Rome of the Jesuit house of Santa Maria della Strada, the Roman College - opened in 1551 in a modest house on Via Capitolina - and the German College, founded in 1552. These initiatives must be placed within Pope Del Monte's broader project. In the first year of his pontificate he confirmed the Society's approval with the bull Exposcit debitum,[127] defining its organization more precisely and emphasizing still more strongly the special bond connecting it to the pope in everything "pertaining to the progress of souls and the propagation of the faith, in whatever country."[128] New privileges, indulgences, authorizations to promote scholastics of the order to the doctorate, and above all - a faculty granted after a meeting with Salmerón in May 1551 - the right "to absolve cases pertaining to heresy in foro conscientiae," that is, privately and secretly, "to console many souls," attest the great favor enjoyed by the Jesuits under Julius III.[129] With the exception of the inquisitorial role soon assumed by the Society in Portugal, not without some hesitation on Loyola's part, Pope Del Monte preferred to use it as a barrier against the intrusiveness of the Holy Office. As Girolamo Nadal observed, the powerful instruments placed at the Jesuits' disposal allowed them to pursue a line toward heretics that was not merely repressive, seeking to convince them through dialogue, prayer, pressure from relatives, confession, and absolution in the internal forum, and turning for help and advice to their superior rather than to the bishop.[130] It was an alternative to the rigors of the Inquisition that until the mid-1550s complemented the general refusal of prelacies and the promotion of more flexible and articulated forms of social penetration through missionary initiatives and, precisely, education in the colleges. The foundation of the Roman and German Colleges formed part of this strategy of conversion and reconciliation promoted by Julius III to curb the growing power of the Inquisition.

The first to be established, in 1552, was the Roman College, whose initiative Morone himself had promoted the previous year in his capacity as protector Germaniae,[131] with the evident aim of clearing away every misunderstanding and erasing the shadows of the past, forging bonds of mutual solidarity and protection with Loyola's followers,[132] and adding a new element to the image of a zealous Catholic that his uncertain record advised him to construct. Someone would even say that he had "seen him associate frequently with Don Ignatius, founder and general of the said congregation, at various times."[133] His decisive role in the birth of the German College in 1552,[134] founded to defend the Catholic faith against heretics,[135] was moreover widely known, as he himself did not fail to emphasize immediately after his arrest:[136]

> Many years ago, seeing that the affairs of Germany were tending toward total ruin for lack of ministers who possessed sound doctrine and good morals, I was the first to propose the way of establishing the German College in Rome, where those young men might be instructed in holy doctrine and good morals under the discipline of those Fathers of Jesus, and then sent to Germany to preach and labor in vinea Domini. From the beginning of the college's foundation until the present hour, which is many years, I have always given more than one hundred scudi a year out of my poverty; by this continuing deed I show that I approve and follow the true doctrine they teach.

The idea of bringing young Germans to Rome to improve their training, which Morone had already conceived during the religious colloquies, was submitted by him to Paul III shortly before the pope's death,[137] and then suggested to Pope Del Monte immediately after his election. The new pontiff's favor was initially checked by the crisis in papal finances, and the definitive project emerged later from a conversation between

the Milanese cardinal and Loyola in the spring of 1552.[138] After once more exerting himself with the pope and Cervini, Morone brought the initiative before the consistory, where he guaranteed a donation of five hundred scudi, thereby winning the favor of the Sacred College. Le Jay was initially considered for the direction of the college under construction, but his death in July of that year led to the summoning of Pedro de Ribadeneira from Palermo, while Ignatius himself defined the course of study, based on the model of the liberal arts in use at Paris and Louvain.[139]

At their origins, therefore, the fortunes of the Society's principal colleges, the Roman and the German - the latter intended in its founders' ambitions to become a residence for young German priests who, after careful training, would be sent back to their homeland to combat heresy - were closely intertwined and encountered similar difficulties. Although Polanco never doubted from the outset that the Roman College would be considered "an ornament to the Holy See," and despite his attempts to remedy the chronic shortage of funds by collecting donations during his Iberian missions, the following years brought grave financial constraints. In 1554 Morone also wrote to Charles V asking for support,[140] and voiced his concerns to the Jesuits who were with him at Augsburg the following year.[141] The situation naturally did not improve with the accession of Paul IV, who, after some initial signs of favor toward the Society - conveyed in part through the Milanese cardinal[142] - soon displayed his old hostility, ordering among other things a search of the house of Santa Maria della Strada. The new pope not only failed to help the Roman College but withdrew all support from the German College, although the institution's objectives were consistent with the pontiff's program of rigidly restoring orthodoxy. Other measures sought to deprive the Society of its constitutional pillars by introducing choir, which drastically reduced the mobility of its religious, and limiting the generalate to three years, which compromised the autonomy and authority of the order's highest office. These measures, imposed only orally, would be revoked after Paul IV's death.[143]

Carafa's hostility toward the Jesuits did not prevent the Roman College from regaining positions of prestige under Pius IV, thanks also to the support of Philip II.[144] Pope Medici openly manifested his favor for the Society, aided by Morone's good offices.[145] Immediately after his election, in December 1559, the new pontiff informed Laínez of his intention to employ the Ignatian order in various ways, and shortly afterward charged the Milanese cardinal - together with Savelli, Este, and Farnese - with restoring the prestige of the Roman College, whose premises were then still a private dwelling near the Arch of Camillus. The Jesuits immediately sent the Milanese cardinal a memorandum on the opportunity to use vacant buildings near the church of San Macuto that they had received as a gift from a noblewoman.[146] Morone warmly supported the initiative and interested the pontiff in it, while attempting to intercede for a less rigid Index and for exemptions from dietary prohibitions on behalf of several Jesuit colleges, including that of Prague.[147] Meanwhile the policy of selecting good teachers established by Ignatius continued: Francisco de Toledo arrived in 1559 to teach logic and later devoted himself to physics, metaphysics, and theology; Juan de Mariana remained at the college until 1565, while the astronomer and

the mathematician Cristoforo Clavius began teaching there in 1564. 148 Between 1563 and 1573 the number of resident students stabilized at about two hundred, one tenth of whom belonged to the German College. 149

Morone's protection of Jesuit educational activities in Rome and Germany did not cease under the pontificate of Pius V, which coincided almost exactly with the generalate of a man exceptional in many respects, Francisco Borja, former viceroy of Catalonia, duke of Gandía, and grandee of Spain, who had secretly been a Jesuit since 1546. 150 During that period the Milanese cardinal also dealt with minor matters, such as the establishment of the Jesuits at Frascati 151 (and in a small lordship south of Prague that "is beginning to be corrupted by Hussites and Lutherans"), 152 and he continued to mediate local disputes between the Society and the Dominicans, whose protector he was. 153 In those years the professed house of Santa Maria della Strada, the order's mother house, saw a steady influx of people attending Laínez's evening lectures. Morone was especially assiduous at them, together with other cardinals and bishops, to the point that in March 1561 Polanco wrote to Nadal that a council might have been assembled there. 154 Firm advocates of frequent communion, the fathers of the Society at Santa Maria heard confessions in great numbers, with no fewer than fifteen Jesuits engaged in the task on Sundays. The communions distributed, even to distinguished persons, were exceptionally numerous on major feasts. At the jubilee proclaimed by Pius IV for the successful outcome of the Council of Trent, no fewer than two thousand people received communion there. 155

Chapter Fourteen

“For Cardinal Morone” or “Against Cardinal Morone”? From Julius III to Paul IV

1. Other Inquisitors, Other Tribunals

Much remains to be understood before we can assess the reactions of individuals, groups, and institutions to the Roman Holy Office’s unstoppable seizure of power during the pontificate of Julius III and to the consequent risk of becoming caught - rightly or wrongly - in the ever tighter meshes of the inquisitorial net. It would, however, be simplistic to reconstruct the political and religious struggle at the summit of the Church as a conflict between two opposing camps: the intransigents and the spirituali, the one armed with inflexible doctrinal rigor and prepared to use every means to eradicate heresy, the other increasingly lost in a labyrinth of nebulous reform projects, Nicodemite caution, and hopes for better times. And between them, trying to assert his authority, a weak and discredited pontiff, lacking theological culture and indeed untouched by any authentic religious sensitivity, incapable of giving events a direction with any prospect of success, and absorbed in building his magnificent suburban villa: “When he is well, he flees every annoyance,” it was written on 3 February 1552, 1 and all the more so when his many ailments confined him to bed. In reality matters were more complicated, because in the early 1550s much of the Sacred College continued to think and act according to political calculations or personal interests, while reforming impulses were still a minority current. The Holy Office’s campaign against anyone who dared obstruct its designs was also checked by the emergence of other approaches to combating heresy and preventing Pole and Morone from ascending the throne of Peter.

Particularly significant, for example, was the not unambiguous role played by Marcello Cervini, at times supported by the Jesuits and by an illustrious Dominican, Ambrogio Catarino Politi, a fierce polemicist against Luther and Savonarola, against the *Summary of Holy Scripture* and the *Benefit of Christ*, yet always ready to follow his own judgment, both in the halls of Trent and in dealing with the spirituali. 2 Within the Holy Office, in fact, which appeared united under Carafa’s leadership, Cervini for a time walked a line of subtle duplicity - as he had done in the conclave 3 - while pursuing an independent strategy. He too sought to prepare the choice of the next pope through the instrument of the Inquisition, but he used it differently. In 1555, as is well known, the tiara would fall to him. A former secretary of Paul III and president of the Council of Trent, he enjoyed a reputation for holiness of life, vast learning, and ardent reforming zeal, as shown by the pious image of the “purest angel clothed in flesh” with which Seripando, on 9 May 1555, would comment on his death only three weeks after his election. Seripando had hoped that Cervini’s pontificate would at last erase “the great shame and derision in which for many years these holy names have been held: Church, council, reform.” 4

In reality, the cardinal of Santa Croce had not been a stranger to the competition for the tiara either, which he owed above all to Carafa’s support. Yet it was only in 1552 that he definitively aligned himself with Carafa, giving up the attempt to carve out an autonomous position and pursue an alternative policy. Relying on his close relationship of trust with Pope Farnese, he had acted in that fashion immediately after the bull *Licet ab initio* and later during the years of the Tridentine legation, especially in the Bolognese phase, even before he was admitted to the congregation of the Holy Office, which happened only in September 1548. Even then, and not without provoking some resentment, he had personally handled cases of heresy. Among other things he dealt with Vergerio, on whom he had begun assembling a dossier as early as 1540 and continued to expand it in later years. 5 He had also closely followed the problem of heterodox preachers, in part because of his role as protector of the Augustinian Hermits. 6

His inquisitorial strategy rested on the principle of being severe with the obstinate while remaining willing to reconcile with the Church those who showed signs of repentance. This was his approach to the heretical centers discovered in Bologna and Faenza in 1547; 7 to the trial of Iacopo Nacchianti in 1548-49,

which in its first phase he directed with the help of his trusted Angelo Massarelli 8 and in whose acquittal he worked actively, as the bishop of Chioggia himself well knew when, from the Minerva convent where he was confined, he wrote on 25 May 1549 that he was “certain that my salvation and release depend in large part on your judgment and will”; 9 and to the heretical ferment in the duchy of Urbino, concerning which the Della Rovere court always maintained direct contact with him, partly because he was bishop of Gubbio. 10 From the mid-1540s onward, beginning with his Tridentine legation, he developed increasing reservations about Paul III’s lack of attention to the spread of heresy. It is no accident that in November 1547 Alvise Lippomano, bishop of Verona, appealed to him for vigorous repressive measures “throughout all the lands of the Church.” 11

From the order’s foundation Cervini had close relations with the Jesuits, who entrusted him with defending their good name after Morone expelled Salmerón from Modena in 1543. 12 During the conciliar legation at Bologna he could rely on their cooperation, beginning with Salmerón himself. The Spanish Jesuit played a decisive role in reopening the doors of the Catholic fold, without forcing him through the ordeal of the Inquisition, to one of the leaders of the city’s religious dissent, the repeatedly mentioned Giovan Battista Scotti. 13 At the end of 1547 Salmerón informed Ignatius of Loyola that some people who had adhered to heretical doctrines or read Lutheran books had been absolved, and that he expected others to arrive soon because news had spread through the city of the punishments inflicted at Rome on certain heterodox believers who had numerous companions in Bologna. 14 The following year Pascase Broët in turn informed the founder of the Society that “the most reverend monsignor of Santa Croce has given Master Alfonso and me authority to absolve those heretics or Lutherans who wish to return to the obedience of the holy Church.” The initiative was not without success, but it provoked protests from the Holy Office and the city’s bishop, forcing the Jesuits to retreat and refrain from such extrajudicial procedures in the future. 15

Cervini’s role also emerges from the dense network of informants on whom he could rely, mostly inquisitors or bishops hoping for promotion, who looked to him - or at least to him as well - to report suspicions of heresy: Grechetto, Tommaso Stella, and Alvise Lippomano in Venetian territory; Girolamo Franchi at Genoa; Tommaso Caselli at Naples; Cornelio Musso; Girolamo Muzio, himself in contact with Stella and Scotti; and many others. Meanwhile men such as Ludovico Beccadelli or Galeazzo Florimonte approached him as an interlocutor capable of vindicating the claims of wise moderation. 16 His operational autonomy is confirmed, for example, by the mild commutation of sentence that Cervini alone signed at the beginning of 1551 in favor of a Bolognese jurist whose case had been at the center of yet another conflict between Julius III and the Holy Office, 17 and by the ease with which at the end of that year he informed Daniele Barbaro, designated successor to Giovanni Grimani in the patriarchate of Aquileia, that he had never been discussed “in the congregation.” 18

It would nevertheless be reductive to attribute the peculiar role assumed by the future Marcellus II - both before and after his admission to the Holy Office - solely to an approach to heresy that was “thorough, and perhaps even […] cautious or balanced,” 19 to his “pragmatism,” or to the “prudence and moderation” acquired through long political experience in Farnese service. There is no doubt that during the Tridentine legation with Pole - and even earlier, when he expressed reservations about the *Benefit of Christ* to Beccadelli, then his vicar in the diocese of Reggio Emilia 20 - Cervini had become aware that doctrines akin to those from beyond the Alps had lodged at the summit of the Church and of the grave danger they entailed. 21 When at the end of 1546 the English cardinal decided to withdraw from Trent in order not to sign the decree on justification, sheltering behind implausible claims of illness, Cervini quickly grasped the truth. On 6 November 1548, as he prepared to set his seal to the finally printed text, he wrote to Massarelli that it was unlikely Pole “would be pleased to do the same.” 22 Gabriel Martenet, the Burgundian penitentiary then living in Cervini’s household, would tell the Holy Office in October 1557 that the cardinal of Santa Croce had openly said Pole was tainted with heresy, while adding that he had by then abandoned those errors and devoted himself to his studies. 23 This was an opinion Carafa could scarcely have shared. He was certainly not prepared to lay down the inquisitorial weapons that Cervini, for his part, did not yet wish to wield. Instead Cervini adopted a more withdrawn and ambiguous role, one not simply assimilable to that of the

intransigents, 24 and maintained the profile of a “reasonable man” in matters of heresy, as Julius III put it. 25 Drawing also on Julius’s esteem and trust, he tried for as long as possible to pursue a strategy different from that of the Theatine cardinal: different more in method than substance, in truth; competitive rather than alternative, since both shared the objective of preventing the promotion to the cardinalate of prelates reputed to be heretics, such as Di Capua (although Cervini justified his opposition only on anti-imperial grounds), 26 and of preventing the papal election of Pole and Morone, at that date still the leading Habsburg candidates for the tiara.

This is what emerges from a startling deposition given by Girolamo Federici on 8 January 1560 during Morone’s defensive proceedings. For Federici it may have been a liberating moment after the difficult years of Paul IV, allowing him both to express his disgust at Cervini’s unscrupulous curial maneuvers and to voice the esteem and gratitude he felt toward the Milanese cardinal, whose orthodoxy he wished to reaffirm: “I spoke many times with His Most Reverend Lordship when I was in the office of the Inquisition, to which I was called in 1550 by the cardinal of Naples, […] about Scripture and matters of faith and the propositions current among us Catholics and Lutherans, and I always found His Most Reverend Lordship Catholic and in no respect at variance with the Roman Church.” 27 On that occasion he recalled the trial held at Rome in 1551-52 against Apollonio Merenda, 28 formerly Pole’s chaplain at Viterbo and a member of the circle formed around Flaminio’s teaching, founded on the principle that “we are righteous through the blood of Jesus Christ and not through our own works.” 29

Marcello, when he was cardinal of Santa Croce - these are Federici’s words 30 - one evening when I was with him in his chamber, while Apollonio Merenda, whom I was examining, was in prison, told me that he wished to say something to me, but first demanded my word that I would tell no one, especially anyone belonging to the Inquisition, even if the occasion arose to speak of it in the Office; and that even if the cardinals asked, “Who is this?” I should take care to say nothing. I gave him my word. Then he said to me: “You must know that in the time of Pope Paul III of holy memory, because of certain suspicions His Holiness had about princes or others, he ordered that letters being sent about, whether by princes or others, should be opened. At that time, when I was either secretary or involved in the secretariat, I opened a packet of letters coming from Trent and found in it a letter that Apollonio Merenda was writing to a great man,” whom he refused to name to me. “And in this letter he said that Cardinal Morone was beginning to go well along Pole’s good road,” or words to that effect, as though he were beginning to enter that school. And I do not remember whether he said that Pope Paul III saw the letter.

In reality, as we shall now see, that letter was most probably never written (nor is there any trace of it in the Milanese cardinal’s trial dossier), still less to a “great man,” since the recipient of the message - oral, not written - had been Giulia Gonzaga. 31 Cervini was therefore deliberately misleading his interlocutor at the very moment he conveyed that sensational information about Morone. More than that: by implying that the cardinal of Santa Croce had been careful not to report the episode to Carafa, Federici’s testimony - besides documenting heavy Roman interference in the council’s proceedings - shows that the Theatine cardinal was not the only member of the Holy Office gathering evidence of heresy against the spirituali for use at the opportune moment. Cervini was doing the same, but differently: not to arm himself with inquisitorial thunderbolts, but to send Morone, through his confidential revelations about that mysterious letter, a blackmailing message that he was certain would reach its destination despite Federici’s oath to keep absolute silence, even from Carafa, Carpi, and Álvarez de Toledo.

Yet an inquisitor telling another inquisitor to say nothing to the inquisitors was too anomalous not to arouse Federici’s suspicion. All the more so because, when Federici predictably observed that the facts could be clarified simply by asking Merenda himself - then on trial at Rome, with the questioning entrusted precisely to Federici - Cervini replied that he did not want him “to ask specifically about Morone in any way,” lest he violate the pope’s orders, and suggested that he proceed so that the accused “would come to say it of his own accord.” Federici did so, but to no effect. Despite his persistent questions, always in the presence of Fra Michele Ghislieri, Merenda denied - even under torture - that he had written such a letter. Later, when the records of the interrogations were read, Federici recalled, “the cardinals looked at one

another” in perplexity, wondering who the mysterious “great man” might be, while “Santa Croce was always making signs to me with his face not to say it.” This first astonished Federici, then led him to question Cervini’s strange behavior, until he convinced himself that Cervini had merely told him nonsense.

Federici was too intelligent and worldly not to reflect that Merenda “is not Morone’s servant and has nothing to do with him, but is Pole’s servant,” about whom he did not hesitate to unburden himself, spontaneously accusing him of “matters of greater importance.” It was therefore difficult to understand “why he would not name Morone in a general matter in which he could be certain of being convicted by his own letters, if it were true that he had written them and they had been taken from him.” 32 The records of the Calabrian priest’s examinations do not in fact show that he mentioned such a letter. Its contents, however, can be identified with what in 1543 Pole’s former chaplain, at Flaminio’s request from Trent, had reported to Donna Giulia in order to inform her and the Valdesians of Naples that Morone had appreciated the *Benefit of Christ* and “showed himself well capable of understanding justification through Christ.” 33 That was precisely what the cardinal of Santa Croce told Federici he had learned from the imaginary letter of that year, whereas he had probably learned it only shortly before by reading the records of Merenda’s interrogations and then inventing the story of the letter out of whole cloth.

In short, Cervini underestimated his interlocutor when he imagined that Federici would swallow those astonishing revelations without objection and cooperate in Cervini’s effort to present himself as a protective shield against the inquisitorial plots threatening Pole and Morone. The Lombard canon lawyer was not a man to take the bait without asking himself questions and finding answers. These enabled him to perceive Cervini’s double game in setting himself up within the Holy Office as an alternative point of reference to Carafa. “The cardinal of Santa Croce is most zealous: how is it credible that, when someone wrote about so important a person, then legate at the council, as he said, he would not have preserved a letter of such importance, if it was indeed important?” Federici asked. And again: “If he was so zealous, why did he forbid me to tell the inquisitors? Why did he not tell them himself? Why did he not examine himself, since he ought to have been examined in the cause of God?” Hence his growing doubts about “the goodness of the said Marcello,” whose moral prestige would otherwise have “made me doubt Morone.” 34 He soon understood that Cervini’s declarations of wishing to soften the Holy Office’s inflexible rigor were accompanied by an underground campaign to discredit the two cardinals’ orthodoxy, exclude them from the ranks of the papabili, and at the same time win their support with an implicit guarantee of immunity.

The episode therefore served only to reinforce Federici’s suspicion that “the good reputation Cardinal Morone enjoyed and the expectation that he would attain a higher rank in the Church might cause people to go hunting for such matters against him.” Julius III often said as much, and Muzzarelli repeatedly expressed to the pope the view that “Pole and Morone were two great and good men, but the papacy did them harm.” 35 From the outset Federici was therefore surprised that Cervini had chosen to confide in him rather than Ghislieri, and he suspected that Cervini’s repeated insistence on absolute secrecy was intended only to make him report every detail to his patron, Cardinal Cicala. Cicala would immediately inform Morone himself, of whom he was “a very close friend,” thereby delivering an unmistakable indirect message. The cardinal of San Clemente himself pointed out that the future Marcellus II knew of their friendship: “He wished to tell you these things in the hope of giving you a bad opinion of him, and that you would then give the same opinion to me. Do you not think he expects you to tell me? If you think otherwise, you are a fool. Indeed, he told you for no other purpose. But even so I would not refrain from voting for Morone and Pole, because I regard them as good men.” 36 The trap set for Federici therefore failed on this occasion, but it helps us understand the behavior and ambitions of the cardinal of Santa Croce and perhaps also tarnishes his image of sanctity.

2. Private Denunciations and Confidential Memorials

Cervini’s personal inquisitorial strategy also appears in several explosive memorials against the spirituali drawn up in Rome in 1551 on the basis of revelations by two Bolognese men repeatedly encountered in these pages: the priest Niccolò Bargellesi and Giovan Battista Scotti. The former was a priest of secure orthodoxy,

whom Flaminio, Soranzo, and Ochino had nevertheless believed at the beginning of the 1540s that they could convert to the Valdesian faith. The latter was a repentant heretic, formerly very close to the English cardinal's friends, whom Pole had helped in 1543 to escape a first sentence by the city's Inquisition through an abjuration. Bargellesi was questioned about Soranzo in Rome on 12 April 1551, 37 but had already been in the city for at least a month. By 15 March the facts known to him - which he could not have discussed in formal proceedings because of the papal ban on questions about cardinals - had been condensed into a short but dense note about the heresies professed by Flaminio, from whom he had received letters that unequivocally demonstrated "that this Marcantonio was a Lutheran." 38

The document refers to Bargellesi in the third person and is rigorously anonymous, without any procedural formula or notarial authentication: no more than a bare memorandum, in short, certainly drawn up by someone deeply familiar with inquisitorial affairs. The identity of that person emerges from another deposition by Bargellesi, this time against Carnesecchi, recorded in Rome on 8 June 1557, in which he again repeated what he knew about Ochino and Flaminio: "And I remember that in 1551, when I was in Rome, I was examined about some of these matters in the convent of the Minerva, I believe by the Master of the Sacred Palace." 39 Not at the Holy Office, then, but at the Minerva; not by an inquisitor, but by Muzzarelli, Julius III's trusted man, who had then been charged with directing the proceedings against Soranzo; 40 not as a formal witness, but privately. It was therefore an informal note, legally worthless, but useful for future reference. Still more disconcerting is the ambiguous title the writer placed on the document based on Bargellesi's revelations, *Pro Marco Antonio Flaminio*, which concealed its accusatory character by blatantly reversing its contents.

Four other memorials were likewise unsigned, undated, without procedural formulas and hence legally null. They were in the same hand and undoubtedly contemporary, and all were based on revelations by Scotti. After relapsing into heresy following his absolution in 1543, Scotti had escaped arrest toward the end of 1546 by taking refuge in Ascanio Colonna's Abruzzese fiefs. Colonna was a great admirer of Ochino and had protected his flight to Switzerland in the summer of 1542. 41 Far from imitating Ochino, however, Scotti returned to Bologna in the summer of 1547. There he found in Marcello Cervini, "then inquisitor and legate of the council in Bologna" beside Cardinal Del Monte, a prelate willing to spare him the death penalty due to relapsed heretics "because of his voluntary appearance and the great signs of repentance he gave." 42 He was therefore able to abjure secretly in the hands of the Jesuit Alfonso Salmerón, closely attached to the cardinal of Santa Croce, whom in 1543 he had already drawn into the affair of his ignominious expulsion from Modena. 43 On that occasion Cervini had at his side the Sienese Dominican Ambrogio Catarino Politi, also active on the front line of the struggle against heresy but not for that reason enlisted in the forces of the Roman Holy Office. Salmerón had persuaded Scotti to acknowledge his "errors," present himself before the two conciliar legates to make "a full confession," and denounce his fellow believers. He thereby obtained permission to abjure once again, which he did in the hands of the Spanish Jesuit, receiving absolution. 44

By the beginning of 1549 Scotti was supplying Cervini with information about suspicious persons and enjoyed his complete confidence: "It seems to me," the cardinal stated, "that Master Giovan Battista will always tell the truth faithfully." 45 More than twenty-five years later, the Roman Holy Office would describe Scotti's services as follows: 46

He has always been entirely sincere in his depositions and has exposed innumerable heretics without regard for any dignity. The Holy Office has therefore received great service from him, because besides uncovering the schools of Rome, the Kingdom, Bologna, Venice, Cremona, Modena, Pisa, and almost all Italy, whenever the Holy Office wished to form a case against some suspect it used to send for him to obtain information. Besides providing whatever writings of theirs he possessed, he would briefly set down in writing whatever occurred to him, both from his own knowledge and as a means of discovering more; he would then be examined. Besides this one concerning Cardinal Morone and the marchioness of Pescara, others are also found in the Holy Office concerning Cardinal Pole, Vittore Soranzo, Priuli, Flaminio, Carnesecchi, the archbishop of Otranto, Guido da Fano, and others named by him. They were so numerous that almost no heretic came before the Holy Office in those days who had not had some dealings with him.

And at all times he persevered in telling the truth without fear, producing excellent results for the Holy Office.

Described in 1552 by Tommaso Stella, bishop of Capodistria, as a person “hostile to those obstinate in evil and most kindly toward anyone who repents of error,” 47 Cervini showed similar mildness toward a Bolognese bookseller associated with Scotti, Francesco Linguardo, about whom he continued to give Massarelli precise instructions even after returning to Rome. 48 In another letter of 15 September, when the culprit had been reimprisoned after an attempted escape, Cervini, acting entirely independently of the supreme Roman tribunal, laid down the conditions under which he might be “pardoned,” including denouncing everyone to whom he had sold prohibited books. 49 This was a policy of carrot and stick, clemency in exchange for denunciation, undoubtedly shrewder and more profitable than Carafa’s blind repression. Against Carafa, Cervini set the path of secret abjuration, admonition, and exhortation “to abandon voluntarily those opinions that were false and harmful to the soul […] so that it would not afterward be necessary to proceed by another route.” 50

The cardinal of Santa Croce had therefore long been collecting evidence of heresy against the spirituali, just as the future Paul IV had, though in competition rather than collaboration with him. The struggle for the papacy, in short, was being fought on several fronts and by several parties. Even within the Holy Office, Carafa was not the only aspirant to the tiara. In the *Tragedy of Free Will*, Francesco Negri described him as “so devoted in his very entrails to this holy Roman see that he would give his soul [and] his body too to the devil for the papacy.” 51 For the moment Cervini accumulated the better-stocked arsenal, securing Scotti’s willingness to name the illustrious prelates with whom he had compromising ties. Yet the *Decreta* of the Holy Office record only a small part of Scotti’s collaboration and the payments made for his services, 52 because at first Cervini alone was his point of reference. Cervini’s correspondence of those years with Massarelli, frequently centered on heretics and heresies, not only in Bologna, documents the relations he maintained with Scotti, who was always ready to send him detailed letters containing “full information” about heterodox believers he had known in the past. Cervini sometimes shared these with his colleagues, convinced that Scotti “always told the truth faithfully.” 53 Salmerón also wrote to him regularly about heretical affairs, 54 while another professional informer, Bishop Grechetto, sent him his furious denunciations. Cervini evidently valued them highly, since on 6 October 1548 he sent him the substantial sum of fifty scudi. 55

The four surviving memorials drawn from Scotti’s revelations - there were undoubtedly many others - likewise reached Cervini, Salmerón, Politi, and perhaps Muzzarelli first, as we shall see, but not the Holy Office. Formally identical to the Bargellesi memorandum, these four documents also concealed their terse allegations about the heresies professed by Soranzo, Pole, Colonna, and Morone under fictitious defensive titles that reveal their common origin: *Pro episcopo Bergomi*, *Pro cardinali Polo*, *Per la marchesa di Peschara*, *Pro c[ardinali] M[orono]*. 56 Only in the last, undoubtedly when it was inserted into the Milanese cardinal’s trial file after proceedings formally began in 1555, was the *Pro* finally corrected to *Contra*. These documents, of course, concerned cardinals, a subject Julius III had forbidden, and for this reason too it was thought prudent to conceal their accusatory import behind those misleading titles, which reveal a kind of paradoxical inquisitorial Nicodemism. It should also be emphasized that the memorials *Per la marchesa di Peschara* and *Pro Marco Antonio Flaminio* concerned people already dead and therefore no longer subject to trial. This shows that the Holy Office sought not only to gather evidence against the spirituali but also to reconstruct the group’s doctrinal profile and historical origins, as is confirmed by the fact that a posthumous inquiry into Contarini was under way at the same time. 57

Like the Flaminio memorial derived from what Bargellesi told Muzzarelli, the memorials based on Scotti’s revelations were not drawn up in the rooms of the Holy Office, as one might assume, but almost certainly in Politi’s Roman residence, where the Bolognese heterodox would later state that he had lived “at the beginning of the pontificate of Julius III.” 58 Salmerón, then at Trent, wrote to him at the bishop of Minori’s house in January 1552, and would still be in contact with “the good Giovan Battista Scotti” in July 1559 during a stay at Naples. 59 The summary of Morone’s trial read in the congregation of the Holy Office

before Paul IV between 2 and 12 June 1559 states that Scotti's memorials had been delivered to the tribunal in 1551. 60 The one concerning the Milanese cardinal can indeed be dated to March of that year, but the summary does not say whether the memorials were disclosed to the Holy Office or to others. The first person to see them - indeed to collaborate in drafting them - was neither Teofilo Scullica nor Michele Ghislieri but undoubtedly Politi, in whose house Scotti had just learned that Morone, "speaking with the most reverend Cardinal Mendoza, otherwise of Burgos, told him that the [Tridentine] decree on justification was not sound and had to be reconsidered." 61 In 1560 Scotti himself would state that he had "associated for a long time" with Catarino, of whom Carnesecchi said that after making "a profession of delighting in Holy Scripture and especially in the works of Valdés," Scotti became his "familiar and secretary." 62

Perhaps already at that time, as proof of the truth of his accusations, Scotti showed Politi the letters addressed to him in 1543-44 by numerous heterodox believers, 63 which he would deliver to the Holy Office only later. "At my latest departure from Rome, which was in the year 1552, I left a deposition with Master Sano [Perelli], notary of the office of the Most Holy Inquisition, in which I stated what occurred to me concerning many persons, to discharge my conscience," he would declare several years later. 64 Thus 1552, not 1551. This creates a further problem, however, because the record of Morone's trial contains no deposition by the Bolognese informer datable to 1552. Scotti may naturally have been mistaken, and his appearance or summons before the Holy Office may have occurred the preceding year, but nothing authorizes us to think so. We should instead note that in the first months of 1552 the proceedings against Bernardo Bartoli took place, "the most important and scandalous case there ever was in Rome." 65 Bartoli too had formerly been associated with Pole and Morone, as Scotti himself noted in the memorial on the English cardinal, stating that the friar had been "seduced by this cardinal concerning justification, the merits of works, and other matters." 66 The striking coincidence between the examinations of Scotti and Bartoli, and the fact that Julius III informed Morone about the latter but not the former, suggests that neither the pontiff nor Muzzarelli knew anything of the Bolognese informer's revelations.

It is likely, moreover, that at first those four memorials were kept by Catarino and known only to Salmerón and Cervini. In any event, it is obvious that the former Bolognese heterodox believer's stay with the Dominican bishop in 1551-52 was anything but accidental, and that he was summoned to Rome expressly to summarize and organize what he had already revealed in the past to the cardinal of Santa Croce, the Spanish Jesuit, and Politi. 67 That Politi was well informed about accusations of heresy against Pole and Morone is confirmed by the advice he gave Don Lorenzo Davidico at about the same time to avoid all dealings with them: "I can tell you that there is something rotten about them." 68 During Scotti's stay in Rome at the beginning of the 1550s, as he would later report to the Holy Office, Catarino spoke to him about certain heterodox members of Pole's household at Trent 69 and told him that he had succeeded in bringing back to the Church the Florentine Pietro Gelido, known as Pero, formerly "seduced by Cardinal Pole." 70 Gabriel Martenet, who was closely associated with his Sienese confrere, would later report that around 1547-48 Gelido had broken off all relations with Catarino, who had instructed him in the Catholic faith, and drawn near to Pole, who had enlightened him with the truth. 71 Pero himself informed Politi in "letters full of reproaches […], complaining of the doctrine he had learned from him according to the Catholic way, as though he had been deceived, and showing that he had found the true light of truth with Cardinal Pole." 72

Gelido would eventually embrace Calvinism and die as a pastor in the Waldensian valleys, but only after another brief return to Catholic orthodoxy, again brought about by Politi. Soon after that sudden conversion to Valdesianism, he wrote to Politi declaring himself repentant and confessing the error into which the English cardinal had persuaded him. 73 After receiving him once more into his house, Catarino did not miss the opportunity to ask "his opinion concerning the repentance of the aforesaid most reverend cardinal and of his other companions," and received the answer that they were "still in the same doctrine as before, meaning the Lutheran doctrine." 74 Politi had therefore long known the English cardinal's doctrinal positions. He had already sought to refute them - without ever naming him - in the *Compendium of Lutheran Errors and Deceptions Contained in an Anonymous Little Book Entitled A Most Useful Treatise on the Benefit of Christ Crucified*, published in Rome in 1544. It is possible that Cervini induced Politi to write the *Compendium*

after being informed of the book's circulation in the diocese of Reggio Emilia. After what they had learned from Beccadelli, Salmerón, Scotti, and perhaps others, it is virtually certain that neither man was ignorant of who stood behind the anonymity of that little book. Catarino's venomous *Compendium* denounced it as Lutheran and Calvinist in order to show the spirituali the inevitable consequences of their Valdesian premises, while warning them to halt at the edge of the heretical abyss if they wished to avoid the rigors of the Holy Office. 75

Thus, while Muzzarelli and Federici had been charged by Julius III with supervising the work of the Holy Office, Politi - perhaps with papal consent as well - seems to have taken charge of a kind of parallel tribunal, also entrusted to apostolic preachers and Jesuits equipped with the necessary authorizations. Immediately after his election Julius III showed the great esteem and trust he felt for the Dominican by calling him to Rome and assigning him an apartment in the Vatican. "Because of his long service and the favors the pope shows him, it is thought that he will be rewarded in accordance with his virtues," the Sienese ambassador reported on 12 February 1550, although imperial opposition would prevent him from receiving the red hat. 76 On 3 June 1552 the pontiff transferred Catarino from the diocese of Minori to Conza; on 11 December of the following year, just after Catarino's death, he appointed Muzzarelli to succeed him there, almost as if to emphasize the unity of purpose and action with which the two had operated at his side. Both, after all, were Dominicans: one with solid experience as inquisitor of Bologna, the other a bishop who had shown in the past not only great acumen in pamphlets directed against transalpine heretics, the *Benefit of Christ*, Bernardino Ochino, and Girolamo Savonarola, but also an irreducible independence of judgment in doctrinal matters. 77 The identical formal structure and titles of the four memorials derived from Scotti's and Bargellesi's revelations disclose their cooperation in trying to curb the Holy Office's excessive power. Both were also committed to the struggle against heresy, but they fought it through strategies independent of, and alternative to, the tribunal ruled with an iron fist by the Theatine cardinal, strategies closer to Cervini's more flexible methods. One may hypothesize that Scotti's summons to Rome was ordered not by Carafa or Ghislieri but informally requested by the cardinal of Santa Croce, 78 and that Cervini supported the operation documented by those memorials and managed by Catarino and Muzzarelli, of which for the moment the supreme tribunal of the faith was not informed, in order to try a different strategy toward the spirituali.

In any event Muzzarelli and Politi, together with Cervini, considered it legitimate and prudent to lock those lethal accusatory documents in a drawer for at least a year. They did so not only to avoid giving Carafa new weapons, but also to keep Pole and Morone in check, induce them to abandon every hope of papal election, and instead support that of Santa Croce, who meanwhile protected them from the inquisitors. In the memorial *Pro cardinali Polo*, Scotti wrote that the "first and great indication" against Pole was the fact that "all those who have been his dear and secret friends and familiars in matters of faith, who proclaimed him and revered him as an angel from heaven and listened to him as an oracle, are all found to be Lutherans." He named Flaminio, Carnesecchi, Priuli, Soranzo, Di Capua, Gelido, Morone, Colonna, and Rullo. That they "were all one and the same thing," he added, "was common report among the Lutheran brethren throughout Italy, who boasted of having so great a support in Rome and hoped that if one day [Pole] were made pope, matters of faith would go as they wished." 79 Relying on his prestige, his reputation as a rigorous reformer, the political experience acquired in Paul III's secretariat, and the autonomy all this gave him even within the Holy Office, Cervini, with the help of Muzzarelli, Politi, and Salmerón, sought to create the conditions for a conclave favorable to himself. He positioned himself, so to speak, midway between Carafa and Julius III, moving with subtle cunning amid the many poisons that contaminated the papal curia.

3. Gian Pietro Carafa's Victory

Only in 1552 did that "hawk disguised as a dove" 80 finally change course. Aware that the game was becoming too dangerous, Cervini decided to align himself with the Theatine cardinal, whose dossiers on the spirituali grew stronger every day while bishops and archbishops were now being put on trial. The tensions, ambiguities, and contradictions accumulated over previous years seemed ready to explode, and the arts of the foil were no longer permissible now that sabers were whistling. The time had come to abandon a personal

policy. Cervini's decision probably arose not so much from the Bartoli affair in the spring of 1552 as from Scotti's simultaneous examinations, in which he could reveal everything he knew about the spirituali, hand over valuable documents, and inform the inquisitors that in the past he had duly reported it all to the cardinal of Santa Croce, who had absolved him extrajudicially in 1547, and to Ambrogio Catarino Politi, whose guest in Rome he had been in 1551.

We cannot know whether Scotti himself decided to escape the protection of those men, whether they - now finding it difficult to continue operating in the shadows - induced him to present himself to Carafa and Ghislieri, or whether the leaders of the Holy Office summoned him on their own initiative. In any case the situation threatened to become embarrassing, and perhaps for that reason too Cervini chose to disappear from the scene during Bartoli's trial, cautiously stepping aside and leaving Muzzarelli and Usodimare to manage the explosive rupture between Julius III and the inquisitors. From early June to mid-October 1552 he refrained from attending meetings of the congregation, to which the pontiff had reconfirmed him two years earlier. 81 It is not unreasonable to suppose that precisely this abandonment of an independent inquisitorial policy enabled Cervini to become Pope Marcellus II with the full support of the Theatine cardinal, who said he was delighted "to have this pontiff and to have played so great a part in his creation, although he says nothing of this and attributes it all to the Holy Spirit," as Cocciano wrote to Seripando on 10 April 1555. 82

One point nevertheless remains to be clarified, and it is decisive in both political and religious terms. Did Cervini's inquisitorial autonomy until 1552 arise solely from a personal strategy for the papal succession, or also from a different conception of the role the tribunal of the faith should play, a different boundary between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, and a different theological and historical perspective from which to view the spirituali's doctrines? Here too Federici's testimony provides valuable evidence, evoking the debates and conflicts of those crucial years. He recalled that both Carafa and Cervini had told him that Martin Luther was right in believing that the very foundations of the papal Church rested upon the doctrine of justification. "Whoever held justification in the Lutheran manner consequently denied the sacrament of penance, purgatory, the merit of works, every satisfaction, and almost every other Catholic doctrine," the cardinal of Santa Croce had explained to him, and for that reason he had wished to ascertain Morone's and Pole's views on that crucial point.

To discover "whether the said Cardinal Morone held any erroneous opinion concerning this justification," Cervini told him that according to the inquisitors "whoever held justification in the Lutheran manner came to deny everything." Morone replied "that whoever held it, or had held it, in that manner was a scoundrel and a heretic." Encouraged by these words, Federici asked him whether the doctrine defended by Pole before the Tridentine decree was the same as that upheld by Contarini at Regensburg, and whether on its basis "one came to deny those things or some of them." Morone did not hesitate to reject the assertion. Asked for his opinion, Stefano Usodimare informed Federici that the doctrine erred only in attributing too much to imputed righteousness and diminishing inherent righteousness. Nothing excessively serious, then; indeed "it had been said and resolved several times in the office of the Inquisition that whoever had held it *ante concilium tridentinum*" could not be considered a heretic, although the doctrine was false. 83 The bishop of Sagone specified that this had been a unanimous decision, followed from the pontificate of Paul III to that of Marcellus II, and therefore "those who held that justification which Pole and certain other prelates at the council were said to have held could not be regarded as heretics." It is not surprising that one of the strongest advocates of this approach to the delicate question was Muzzarelli, according to whom one could speak of heresy only *nisi post decretum concilii tridentini* [after the decree of the Council of Trent]. 84 It amounted to wiping the slate clean, a genuine advance absolution intended above all for the spirituali. Federici would in fact recall that what legitimized the inquiry begun in 1551 against Di Capua was evidence that he had continued to adhere to the notorious "article of justification" even after the Tridentine decree of 13 January 1547. The historical and theological watershed of heresy was therefore "settled" by the Holy Office at the date that canon was approved, in a decision Carafa undoubtedly opposed and in any case refused to follow.

The decision to suspend all inquiry into heterodox opinions and conduct predating 1547 offered Pole and Morone, if only briefly, an escape route from the inquisitorial net in which they were becoming more

entangled each day. According to Federici, Morone then told him repeatedly that “after the decree of Trent [Pole] and he always held justification in the manner determined by the council […], *et quod absit ab eis quod aliter sensissent*” [and far be it from them to have thought otherwise]. 85 That this was not in fact so is shown by numerous indications, foremost among them Scotti’s memorial *Contra cardinalem Moronum*. It states that even in the early 1550s Morone had said “that a decree of the Council of Trent on justification ought to be destroyed, as being unsound, and another made in accordance with the truth.” 86 Morone naturally took care to deny this in the *confessio* written immediately after his arrest, declaring that he had adhered to Contarini’s doctrine of justification “until the conclusion reached at the Council of Trent on the said article,” although he imprudently added that “the authentic approval by the pope of that council has not yet been given, without which it is known that councils are not valid.” 87 A letter of denunciation sent to Paul IV in June 1557 would contradict him, confirming Scotti’s charge. 88 During the much more benevolent pontificate of Pius IV, Carnesecchi too would try to appeal, so to speak, to the principle of pre-Tridentine immunity. In a letter to Giulia Gonzaga of 2 December 1560 he complained of the inquisitors’ intransigence in wishing him to abjure “certain things which, besides not being even erroneous, much less heretical, they cannot prove were approved by me beyond a certain point, that is, until the council determined otherwise on the matter.” In November 1566, during his final trial, he recalled the discussions at Viterbo in 1541-42, in which “no other article of religion was discussed than justification by faith; and this cannot be said to have been heresy at that time, since the council had not yet determined what was to be believed concerning that article.” 89

Scotti’s revelations were therefore particularly valuable in Carafa’s eyes, because they allowed him to overcome the chronological barrier imposed upon judicial inquiries, a barrier he regarded as wholly arbitrary. The authenticity of the alleged illness that had caused Pole to withdraw from Trent thus became a crucial question for establishing retroactively the English cardinal’s full adherence to the Tridentine decree, a point on which Beccadelli’s biography would not accidentally insist. 90 Federici himself, as noted, sought to learn more and predictably encountered entirely conflicting versions: “And because I had been told, I do not know whether by Cardinal Santa Croce or by other prelates, that Cardinal Pole, when legate, had departed so as not to be present at the determination being made concerning the article of justification, I told Cardinal Morone, who replied that this was not true, but that he had left because of an illness.” 91 Federici also questioned Morone about the English cardinal’s embarrassing associations in the 1540s. Morone, Pole’s “great friend,” lost no opportunity to defend him as “a good man and a Catholic,” maintaining that precisely through his friendship with men such as Merenda, Flaminio, and numerous “other suspects” he “had converted many and brought them back to the right path,” as Morone would later write in his *confessio*. 92 When Cardinal Álvarez de Toledo warned him not to “associate with these suspects,” Pole replied “that he was converting them.” 93 Neither Pole nor Morone, moreover, had ever concealed the conviction “that these heretics should be brought back through charity and not with such severity, and rather by kindness and gentleness than by such rigor.” 94

The ruling that an accusation of heresy against anyone - and all the more against bishops, archbishops, and cardinals - could apply only to conduct after the Tridentine decree was therefore short-lived. After 1552, when Cervini surrendered before Carafa’s success in imposing his repressive policy upon the supreme tribunal of the faith, rivalries, differentiated strategies, and internal opposition within the congregation ceased. The edicts of grace issued by Julius III two years earlier were nullified by a Holy Office decree forbidding confessors to absolve those guilty of heresy. 95 The Dominican order, which until then had largely supported the pontiff’s choices, was rapidly brought into line with Carafa’s rigorist policy. 96 Men such as Girolamo Federici could no longer play any role within the congregation, and Pope Del Monte too had to accept this state of affairs. In 1553 he relieved Federici of his duties in the tribunal by promoting him to vice-legate of the Patrimony of Saint Peter, a kind of formal renunciation - after the contested retraction of Fra Bernardo - of interference in the work of the Holy Office. Muzzarelli likewise left the papal court, as noted, rewarded with a bishop’s miter and appointment as nuncio to the emperor shortly after Politi’s death. 97

At precisely that time a different Habsburg policy was also taking shape, forced by a dramatic financial collapse aggravated by new military challenges in France, Germany, and Italy and destined eventually to result in Charles V's abdication and the dynastic division of his dominions. 98 The age of anti-curialism, of the solemn protest against transferring the council to Bologna, of Pier Luigi Farnese's assassination, and of an Italian policy entrusted to men such as Diego Hurtado de Mendoza and Ferrante Gonzaga had ended, and with it "the dreams of an imperial council and reform." 99 On 12 November 1551, for example, Francisco Vargas wrote from Trent to Granvelle, denouncing with helpless indignation the papal legates' opposition to every serious initiative against curial abuses: "They are blind men who have firmly resolved to think of nothing but their carnal and worldly interests; the fact that everything is going to ruin causes them no concern." 100 The pro-Habsburg party in the Sacred College was itself disintegrating. Pole and Morone were increasingly isolated, while Álvarez and Carpi had replaced their traditional political loyalties with inquisitorial militancy, ready to disobey the emperor rather than betray their conscience in defending the faith and the Church. 101 It is no accident that in 1553 the imperial ambassador in Rome, Don Juan Manrique de Lara, an admirer and personal friend of Morone, 102 took care to warn Charles V that Morone was the best ally and confidant on whom he could rely within the Sacred College, far more than the untrustworthy cardinal of Carpi, and urged him to demand greater unity and concord within his party. 103 By then the outcome of the future conclave had already been decided, in Rome rather than Brussels, and with it the political and religious direction of the future pontiff.

Thus ended a decade of inquisitorial history: a history still largely obscure and destined to remain so because of the almost total loss of documentation, beginning with the Theatine cardinal's correspondence. From its origins it appears marked by lucid clarity of objectives and strategies, as shown by the battle Carafa waged in the 1549 conclave to prevent the success of his most feared opponent, whom, as Vergerio wrote, he "kept in distress and would not allow to emerge into the papacy." 104 Despite their political role and personal prestige, by contrast, no attempt is known by Pole or Morone to mount an effective response to Carafa's attack, a response in some sense precluded by their own doctrinal contradictions. For this reason too the Theatine cardinal was able to remain firmly at the head of the Holy Office and was forced only to make verbal concessions at moments of difficulty. Julius III undoubtedly had good reasons to defend the two authoritative cardinals, protected by imperial favor and, for different reasons, indispensable pieces in papal diplomacy, in whose "virtue and goodness" he placed "particular" trust. 105 His interventions to prevent the Inquisition from pursuing the proceedings against them and other persons linked to them to the end nevertheless indicate that the pontiff may have had the will but not the strength to regain control of the Inquisition, and had to limit himself to sporadic attempts to block its most dangerous initiatives. In any case, the dualism of powers, mutual distrust, and rancorous hostility that divided the pontiff and the Holy Office provide eloquent evidence of the political, religious, and institutional conflict at the summit of the Church during Julius III's pontificate and of the uncontrollable degree of autonomy that the supreme inquisitors succeeded in carving out for themselves in decisions crucial to the Church as a whole, ultimately establishing themselves as the dominant force.

Pope Del Monte, untouched by the anxieties that had traversed Italian religious life in those years, certainly failed to grasp the deep reasons for the clear and radical choices that animated the Theatine and his twenty-year commitment to a reform of the Church founded on unlimited theocratic authority. That project drew its very reason for being, its certainties, and its energy from an uncompromising struggle against heretics and the assertion of supremacy over every other power. From this perspective Pole and Morone did not appear to Carafa merely as a party to be defeated, but as a satanic heretical cancer lodged in the heart of the Church, which had to be excised as quickly as possible and by every means before its metastases spread to bring about the total collapse of the Catholic faith. It is therefore unsurprising that the role of the Holy Office became preeminent during vacancies of the Holy See, when its autonomous structure, in the absence of a strong central authority imposing limits and directives, could assert both its institutional role and the stature of the man who led it.

After the long conflict with Julius III - considerably diminished after 1553 - Carafa's election under the name Paul IV marked the moment when the policy of the Holy Office effectively became the policy of the papacy, creating a symbiosis destined to endure. One of the very first acts of his pontificate was the formal opening of proceedings against Morone. The first witness called against him was the ever-available Bernardo Bartoli, ready to confirm his old charges and revoke the retraction whose sincerity Carafa had never believed. 106 Thus, far removed from the halls of Trent and devoid of even the faintest reforming impulse, the tenacious battle waged by the Holy Office to establish itself as the supreme theological and political authority of the Roman Church reached fulfillment. In the following decades its many consequences would emerge in the control of the religious life of clergy and laity, ecclesiastical careers and episcopal autonomy, the repression of dissent, forms of devotion and worship, sacramental practices, and more generally the implementation of the Tridentine decrees of reform. A new historical season was beginning, one destined for a long time to mark the Church of the Counter-Reformation, its tenacious authoritarian models, its conception of theological and moral magisterium, its pastoral practice, and the very religious identity of Catholic Italy.

4. "How Can You Be So Shameless?": Don Lorenzo Davidico Again

Meanwhile Davidico too supplied new material for the Roman Holy Office's evidentiary arsenal. He went to Rome in the autumn of 1553, still furious over the Novara humiliation and eager for revenge by raising against Morone the banner of his own orthodox intransigence. Yet he did not dare - or was advised not - to lodge a formal denunciation against the powerful Milanese cardinal, fearing that he would be "crushed, having seen many times in Rome that whoever is stronger wins and that in the end no action is taken against great men." 107 He therefore preferred to approach Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi privately, knowing full well that he was one "of the lords appointed against heretics," and to report his suspicions "under the seal of confession, […] for the charity and benefit of the Church" and "to discharge [his] conscience." 108 He had long known the cardinal of Carpi, to whom in 1550 he had dedicated his *Spiritual Enclosure* and whom he had met in Rome the previous year during the proceedings against the Milanese Barnabites. 109 Hence his decision to confide in him, without witnesses, "in his chamber in Rome," in November 1553, 110 precisely when he was writing a short treatise *De hodierno ac deplorando mundi statu*, in which he again railed against the "*lutherana haeresis quae animas furatur*" [Lutheran heresy that steals souls]. 111 Yet it was a sacramental confession, he would later insist, not a deposition, because he believed it sufficient to have reported his "thought and suspicion to the said monsignor of Carpi, although I was not formally examined." 112

One may instead wonder why, after hearing Davidico's sulfurous accusations, a severe inquisitor such as Carpi did not immediately direct him to the Holy Office and order him to formalize a denunciation that would have allowed full proceedings to be opened against a cardinal who, among other things, was his principal rival for Charles V's favor in view of the next conclave. 113 But the uproar caused the year before by Bernardo Bartoli's similar denunciation against Pole and Morone must be borne in mind. That affair had ended with the sensational retraction of the "idle friar." 114 One can therefore understand why Carpi preferred to avoid another incident, especially given Don Lorenzo's terrible reputation and his recent personal clash with the Milanese cardinal, which deprived his testimony of all credibility. For the moment it was better that the accusations remain in some archive of memory, from which they might reemerge at the most opportune time. Shortly afterward, at the end of January 1554 in Spoleto, Davidico himself reported what he knew about Morone to the inquisitor Matteo Lachi, to whom he had already communicated his suspicions before arriving in Novara. In particular he told him how at first the cardinal had appeared to appreciate his efforts "to enlighten those souls according to Catholic doctrine," yet had advised him to preach "a true and full Christian doctrine," namely "Christ with the mysteries of his Gospel," without speaking "of saints, merits, and similar things." Don Lorenzo's scandalized reply - "Ah, most reverend monsignor, what are you saying to me? What things are these? I am a Catholic and a son of the holy Roman Church" - had so disturbed and irritated Morone that "they were never reconciled again." 115

On that occasion the Vercellese priest informed Lachi that he had also disclosed everything to the Roman Holy Office, naming not only the cardinal of Carpi but also Cervini and Carafa. 116 Was this an imprecise recollection by the inquisitor of Perugia, or Davidico's boasting of connections he did not have? 117 It is difficult to say. In later years, when he mistakenly believed that these very charges were the cause of his troubles with the Inquisition, the Vercellese priest would declare himself repentant for having expressed his suspicions "with some force and astonishment," because of the zeal that moved him and "the unfavorable opinion I then had of His Most Reverend Lordship," only to change his mind after being reconciled with him. 118 Yet he could not deny that according to his opinion at the time he had "told the truth to the most reverend of Carpi." 119 This would later allow the Holy Office to transform his confession into evidence of the Milanese cardinal's public reputation for heresy: evidence so important in the inquisitors' eyes that it justified using Davidico's later examinations to reconstruct its contents retrospectively and transpose it into a formal act valid for the inquiry against Morone. After Paul IV's election, in other words, the cardinal of Carpi's "archive of memory" could be used to turn an oral confession into a written text and backdate later depositions, constructing *ex post* a record that the different political and religious circumstances of 1553 had discouraged them from drafting. The result would be a document false in form but authentic in substance, explained by the tribunal's need - under precise procedural rules - to attest Morone's public reputation for heresy, which a few years later would authorize it to open proceedings against him even without a denunciation. 120

"Since 1550 I have heard from various people that the most reverend Morone was a heretic," Don Lorenzo would begin, without realizing that he thereby risked plunging into an inextricable thicket: on the one hand by giving the impression that he knew more than he actually did, and on the other by attracting suspicion that for unconfessable reasons he had long concealed what he knew. In reality he did not merely report the rumors that had reached him from several quarters in previous years, but insisted above all on what he himself had seen and heard as an eyewitness in Novara. There, among other things, Morone had allegedly told him that the faithful must be taught to "confess to God" and "attach souls to Christ," making him "suspect that he excluded the invocation of saints." The suspicions Ambrogio Catarino Politi had planted in him shortly before in Rome found full confirmation in the Milanese cardinal's rebukes for his preaching against heresy: "Vicar, I do not like this zeal of yours. Those whom you consider Lutherans may be better Christians than you." Hence Davidico's conclusion that Morone's positions were entirely "Lutheran." 121

After being expelled from Novara, however, Davidico had not confined himself to reporting his accusations of heresy against Morone to the cardinal of Carpi in Rome and later to Lachi in Spoleto. An inveterate graphomaniac, he had taken up pen and paper "to compose a book against His Most Reverend Lordship." When the cardinal learned of that "dialogue and infamous libel" and became alarmed at the poisonous slanders it was destined to spread, he allegedly first had Davidico threatened and then sent his loyal followers Filippo Gheri and Girolamo Rovelli "to climb through the window of his chamber […] or enter it by force, in order to take the book from him." 122 The act of intimidation was all the more sensational because Don Lorenzo was then a guest in the palace of Filippo Archinto, papal vicar for the city of Rome. 123 For this or some other reason, the dialogue remained unfinished, and the author himself decided to dispose of the draft, using part of it for less than noble purposes - "he put it, speaking with reverence, beneath the footstool," to use it "for necessary bodily needs" - and giving the rest to Muzzarelli, who, as he would later report, "praised me for having torn it up." 124 Some time later, in another short *Dialogue* concerning these events, Davidico would even allege an attempt on his life on the night of 13 January 1554, from which he had miraculously escaped. 125 Whether true or false, there is no doubt that the atmosphere of Rome was becoming increasingly unbreathable for him. It was therefore better to leave as quickly as possible, at least for a while.

Ten days later, presenting himself as "visitor and vicar *in spiritualibus*," he was already in Spoleto. There he met Lachi and once again gave free rein to all his anger against Morone. In Spoleto and especially Perugia he resumed leadership of the "congregations of men and women" he had previously gathered around himself, which continued to give the Jesuits "a bad odor," and tried to revive his customary strategy of imposing

mortifications on his disciples. 126 He also sought to gain influential protectors, such as Cardinal Fulvio Della Cornia, to whom he dedicated two works published a few months later in Rome, 127 and the city's vice-legate Michele Della Torre, to whom he dedicated a volume of *Opuscoli* printed at Perugia in April 1554 with Lachi's imprimatur. 128 In one of the little treatises collected there, *The Christian's Journey*, Davidico could not resist inserting an allusive attack on Morone. It is not difficult to identify in it the "great hypocrite" whom he had once regarded as "a saint because of his fine words": "And then I found him to be a Lutheran, and because I refused to consent to his whims, he secretly brought a great persecution upon me. By his goodness God brought great fruit from it for me through victory, besides giving me strength to remain steadfast upon the cross." 129

The echo of the controversies following the Novara experience is still more evident in another dialogue included among these *Opuscoli*, *Heartbreak*. There Don Lorenzo evoked the corrupt and refractory clergy, priests "for the most part a scandal to the world, one through one vice and another through another, swordsmen and in many places faction leaders, gamblers, seditious men, concubinaries," devoid of the most elementary religious knowledge, with whom he had been forced to contend in the summer of 1553. Still more explicit, in recalling the "various dangers and snares" from which he had escaped, was his invective against "shepherds of souls turned wolves." In this imaginary dialogue with Urban, identifiable as the bishop-elect of Senigallia, Urbano Vigeri Della Rovere, Peregrino - an evident pseudonym for Davidico modeled on Saint Ignatius - opened as follows: 130

PEREGRINO Not many months ago, to my misfortune, I encountered a man now great in the world who, because of his fine words, is regarded as a saint, yet is a rotten heretic and a great Lutheran.

URBAN How did you escape from his hands?

PEREGRINO With great difficulty, danger to my life, and suffering, because I refused to do what he wanted.

URBAN It seems to me all the more serious because those who ought to set their hands to God's works often destroy them; they are more possessed by spirits than spiritual.

In May-June 1554 Don Lorenzo again met Filippo Archinto in his Roman palace. Archinto tried to calm him and persuade him to abandon his suspicions concerning Morone. 131 On 9 November he was still at Perugia, 132 but two weeks later he had already returned to Rome, where he resumed contact with Loyola and the Jesuits and published two little works dedicated to Cardinal Della Cornia. 133 In the first, *La Davidica*, the very title suggested an easy identification between the king of Israel and the Vercellese priest. They were the two interlocutors in a dialogue in which one answered the other's questions with the Psalms. Don Lorenzo reaffirmed his firm determination "to live and die a Catholic and faithful son of the holy Roman Church" and insisted on recalling the "considerable suffering" he had recently endured "through the operations of wicked men." 134 These were grave words but contained no concrete personal reference. They therefore acquired precise meaning only for those already familiar with the events and capable of understanding the implicit allusions to the struggle between little David and the giant Goliath or to the persecutions he later endured from King Saul. 135 At the beginning of the summer of 1554 Davidico was in Verona "to take the waters of the baths," as a guest of Bishop Alvise Lippomano. He had known Lippomano more than ten years earlier during the first Barnabites' mission to Verona and had met him again the year before on his journey to Novara, mentioning the suspicions about Morone that he had long heard from several quarters and that Lippomano fully shared. In November, after a brief stop at Perugia, Davidico was already back in Rome, having conversed during the journey with Cardinal Pietro Bertano and emerged with "grave suspicion" about his orthodoxy. 136

Frightened by the many powerful enemies he had managed to make, Davidico finally decided to pour water on the flames of his controversy with the Milanese cardinal and seek some path to reconciliation. Thus, toward the end of 1554, he spoke with an old acquaintance, the apostolic writer Basilio Ferrari, a friend and correspondent of the Milanese Barnabites and brother of Bartolomeo Ferrari, one of the order's founders. 137 The previous year Ferrari had happened upon him in Saint Peter's Square and severely rebuked him for what

had reached his ears: “Are you still walking about Rome? I fear and suspect that you yourself are seeking to be sent to the galleys, if even a thousandth part is true of the foul things they say you committed in the diocese of Novara.” Now, meeting him again and thoroughly disillusioned about this ambiguous figure after “the many, many outrageous things” he had heard, Ferrari again pressed him to repent and change course. He advised him “not to wander about any longer” and to withdraw “to live under a rule in some good place,” as he wrote to Milan in October 1555: 138

What shame, what blame, and what grave and most grievous sin is yours: having chosen to profess and live as a priest and regular religious, for many years you have delighted in wandering now here, now there. Consider the honor and disgrace you have brought back from the diocese of Novara. How can you be so shameless as still to dare appear in Rome and go to speak again with the most reverend Cardinal Morone or with other cardinals and prelates, all of whom have been informed of your many and various grave errors? Had the aforesaid most reverend Morone not possessed the good and excellent nature he has, and had he not taken pity on you, you would certainly find yourself brought to a sorry pass.

It was probably after this severe reprimand that Davidico decided to attempt a reconciliation with Morone, as the latter would later recall in his *confessio*: “One day he came to ask my forgiveness on his knees, saying he could not celebrate Mass unless I forgave him, which I did, because he had slandered me contrary to the truth, driven by the dishonor inflicted on him by me and my ministers on account of his bad conduct, as the trial record shows.” 139 Some time later the cardinal would specify two details that Davidico had allegedly revealed to him on that occasion. First, the initiative to reveal to the Inquisition his suspicion that Morone held erroneous opinions about the saints had resulted from advice given by others; second, he had written the insulting dialogue later destroyed not only from the anger in his heart, but because in November 1553 he had been persuaded to do so “*a quodam cardinali*” [by a certain cardinal], 140 perhaps Carpi. Now the wind had changed - or poor Don Lorenzo imagined it had - and nothing remained but to make amends for his slanders, “promising him that no further word against you will issue from me.” 141 After these admissions Morone agreed to forgive him and perhaps even used his good offices to appease the pontiff’s wrath. The pope, it seems, had learned of the affair and contemplated sending Davidico to row in the galleys. 142

During the inquisitorial trial he would soon face, Davidico returned repeatedly to that long conversation, emphasizing that Morone had omitted nothing in reassuring him of his orthodoxy: “He entered into various spiritual discussions, with long useful and good discourses, through which he gave me great edification, and I remained very satisfied with him and of good opinion concerning his faith and doctrine.” 143 This apology can be explained only by Don Lorenzo’s conviction that all his troubles stemmed from the imprudence with which in previous years he had made grave accusations against that illustrious cardinal. He struggled to understand that what was wanted from him was precisely their formal confirmation. Hence, paradoxically, his attempt to soften his earlier statements on the basis of the explanations Morone gave him at that meeting, and his admission that he had been “greatly in the wrong” toward Morone, in the hope of winning the favor of one who - unbeknown to him - was an accused man like himself. The only result was to reinforce the judges’ doubts about Davidico. He humbly acknowledged a double wrong in a petition addressed to the cardinal inquisitors on 9 March 1556: first, for not having admonished Morone concerning his errors “with the charity and modesty I ought to have used”; and then, after hearing him “speak so Catholicly,” for not immediately informing those to whom he had previously communicated his suspicions of this reassuring change, although from then on he had missed no opportunity to mention Morone “with every reverence.” 144

The reconciliation, however, did not close the Novara incident or the chapter of difficult relations between the cardinal and the Vercellese priest. Soon after leaving Rome, Davidico resumed his wanderings through central Italy, now traveling to the Marches to weave another thin network of relations with his alleged disciples in search of an improbable role as protagonist, master, and saint. As time passed, this faded into the increasingly urgent need to find some way of earning a living. Still reputed to be a man “*non exiguae auctoritatis*” [of no small authority] and even “one of the leading preachers of Italy,” 145 he preached Lent in Loreto in 1555 together with a Jesuit father. He took the opportunity to renew his requests for admission to

the Society - whose protector, it bears remembering, was then the cardinal of Carpi - but received a courteous refusal. 146 There, shortly after Julius III's death, between late March and early April 1555, he met Cardinal Cervini. 147 He would later say that Cervini summoned him to Rome after the conclave so that he might formalize his suspicions concerning the many crypto-Lutherans known to him, including some prominent prelates: 148 "Father Lorenzo," the cardinal of Santa Croce allegedly told him, "once the pope has been elected, come to Rome and remind me of the matter we discussed." 149 The reconciliation with Morone and the promise to Ferrari that he would withdraw quietly somewhere were therefore quickly forgotten. At precisely this time, in the first months of 1555, Davidico thought it prudent to draw the records of the Novara trial once more from his bag and submit them to several jurists and lawyers, asking their opinion and entering their statements in his favor in a special dossier. This initiative probably arose less from a desire to rake over the embarrassing affair again and pursue new and ever more belated revenge than from the wish to obtain documents useful in silencing the terrible reputation surrounding his name after an incident that he himself had helped turn into a widely known case, whose echoes had even reached the pontiff's ears. Hence his effort to collect this little catalogue of extravagant praise, often written in an artificial and bombastic style that betrays its authors' provincial culture.

It was, in short, a wretched attempt - and a kind of constant hallmark of Don Lorenzo's existence - to recover a credibility repeatedly lost through his irascible impulsiveness, unscrupulous ambition, and irrepressible opportunism. That credibility was all the more necessary when Cervini's summons to Rome and then his pontificate seemed to offer new hope. Marcellus II's sudden death on 30 April, three weeks after his election, frustrated this illusion as well and rendered useless the bloodless dossier Davidico had been assembling in the preceding weeks and carried with him when he returned to Rome in May 1555. 150 His campaign to obtain attestations of strict morality and irreproachable Catholic militancy may still have been under way when it was abruptly ended in June by a summons from the Holy Office, destined to mark a tragic turning point in Don Lorenzo's life. His unhappy collaboration with Morone in the diocese of Novara, the controversies arising from it, and the revenge he had sought with a good measure of impudence were destined to cost him dearly after Gian Pietro Carafa's ascent to the papal throne. That election made unmistakably clear the political and religious orientations now prevailing in the Roman curia and marked a radical turn to which Don Lorenzo too would be called to contribute. The uncertainty, confusion, and rash impulses with which he reacted to the summons of the supreme tribunal of the faith, while the solemn ceremonies for the new pontiff's installation were still under way - and certainly at the latter's express will - would sweep him away without escape. The unfortunate Vercellese priest would become a small cog in the infernal inquisitorial machine that Paul IV was shortly to set in motion, assuming the role of Morone's accuser for which he himself had eagerly volunteered with his denunciation of 1553. All this, together with his inability to play the part assigned him by the inquisitors, would cost him four long years in prison, punctuated by ever new accusations, sentences, escape attempts, sufferings, and humiliations of every kind.

5. The Diet of Augsburg and the Death of Julius III

Meanwhile, as we have seen, Morone had reluctantly accepted the task Julius III assigned him of overseeing from Rome Pole's difficult mission in his homeland. 151 The restoration of Catholicism there encountered many obstacles, while Charles V viewed with suspicion the return home of a papal legate in whose veins royal blood flowed.

What alarmed the Milanese cardinal was not only his human, religious, and political closeness to a man whom the Holy Office considered a heretic, 152 but also - a genuine leitmotif of his existence - the potential conflict implicit in his dual loyalty to pope and emperor. Yet the hope of consolidating England's return to Roman obedience led Julius III to support the Habsburg marriage plans. Hence the initial tension with Pole, who was anxious to land on the island even though Charles V warned him that "whoever went to England at this time in the name of the Apostolic See would be going to have himself cut to pieces." 153 As early as 23 October 1553, for example, Morone had to explain the good reasons that led the emperor to keep him on the continent a little longer: not to "rush forward with closed eyes," but "to temporize and […] walk with eyes

open." He informed him that Julius III shared those reasons. "Against His Majesty's will it would have been difficult to accomplish any good," he insisted two weeks later. 154 Only in November 1554, almost a year and a half after Edward VI's death, could the English cardinal reach London, "held in very good opinion by the queen and much loved by her and by other great men." 155

Pole, for his part, rejoiced at Morone's return to Rome. Until then Muzzarelli had been his principal interlocutor there, but he now declared himself certain of receiving all the assistance he could expect "from your piety and prudence." 156 The return was prompted by "various causes and considerations, some pertaining to the government of the church of Novara and others of importance," the Milanese cardinal wrote with guarded reticence on 9 November, perhaps alluding to Davidico's inquisitorial intrigues. 157 No less allusive were the words with which Pole, in his reply of 1 December, reiterated his satisfaction because, "the matter being pious and holy, I wished as far as possible that it should be handled *per pias manus* [by pious hands] of those who have the same end that by God's grace I feel myself to have." 158 Political disagreement remained over the Spanish marriage and the timing of Pole's landing in his homeland. In response to Pole's explanations, Morone informed him that the pope considered "the desire to prevent this marriage not only dangerous but also harmful to religion and the interest of this Holy See," and that it would therefore be well for his legate to act accordingly. "There is no need for me to say anything further about my own opinion, since His Holiness is resolved upon this and it is necessary to obey him," he concluded, informing him that Muzzarelli was being sent to the Brussels court. 159 "Your Most Reverend Lordship's journey to England must take place when and as it pleases His Imperial Majesty and the queen," he reiterated on 8 January 1554, reminding Pole that for the moment his principal task was to serve as legate for peace between the emperor and the king of France. 160 Morone was also troubled by Julius III's very poor health: "May God preserve him, for in these times there is no need of a vacant see!" he wrote on 9 March to his English colleague, who would have wished Morone to replace him had the pope recalled him to Rome. 161

The correspondence between the two cardinals became increasingly sporadic in 1554. Only on 15 December did Morone break his silence to rejoice at the English Church's return to the Roman fold with an entirely "spiritual" joy, which "proceeds from that same divine grace from which so great a resolution arose in the hearts of those peoples." Expressing the hope that it would extend "through all Christendom, bringing the erring back to truth and the faithful to a life worthy of their profession," and reporting the rejoicing of the pontiff and the entire Sacred College, he emphasized that at last people understood "the extraordinary and miraculous progress of this whole affair and gave the glory to God," whose "heavenly design" in determining the outcome of the previous conclave had finally been revealed. Only now could one understand the providential plan that "exceeds all human judgment" and had manifested itself in Pole's failure to be elected, as though God had wished to preserve him to restore the Catholic faith in his homeland. 162 Meanwhile Vergerio continued to assail the English cardinal with anonymous letters, pirated editions, and venomous pamphlets, portraying him as all the more guilty of persecuting the true faith because he had once adhered to it. 163 Given the atmosphere in Rome, Pole could only rejoice, thanking God that he was "slandered from every side and in every manner," as he wrote to Morone on 10 June 1554. 164

At precisely that time, moreover, a new front opened with the appointment of the Milanese cardinal as legate to the Diet of Augsburg. The threatened recognition of the Lutheran confession required the dispatch of a man equal to the task, able to employ his personal prestige, knowledge of the German world, diplomatic talent, and the confidence he enjoyed among the Habsburg rulers in an effort to mediate and avert a serious defeat for the Holy See. Morone himself informed Pole on 15 January 1555, reporting the urgent requests of Charles and Ferdinand of Habsburg 165 and the pope's consent, although on condition "that the diet make progress." It did not appear to be doing so, much to the Milanese cardinal's satisfaction, since he would thereby be spared a mission "difficult and dangerous in many respects." 166 In January Cardinal Dandini declared himself convinced that the English success had induced the pontiff to overcome his

hesitation 167 and send Morone to the German diet “in the hope that the same divine kindness and mercy that has worked in the hearts of the English may in its goodness work likewise in those of the Germans.” 168 Muzzarelli expressed the same confidence in a letter from Brussels dated 28 January 1555: “I am beginning to hope that the divine Majesty will have mercy on afflicted Germany, now that He is sending it such ministers.” 169

Morone’s formal appointment, with very broad faculties, took place in the consistory of 7 January 1555, and the bull was signed two days later. On the 12th he was given the cross, and on the 16th the briefs were dated containing his credentials for Charles, Ferdinand, and Maximilian of Habsburg, the prince-electors, Cardinals Madruzzo and Truchsess, who were to receive him along the way, and the German bishops. 170 At last the pope decided to respond to the appeals that King Ferdinand and Truchsess had been sending to Rome since the summer of 1554, when at Augsburg they were preparing to “speak about religion, and it will be greatly necessary to use every prudence, skill, and diligence to bring the dispositions here to firm constancy.” Thus Truchsess wrote to the Milanese cardinal on 6 February, hoping that he would arrive “before the intrigues of our adversaries have gained ground, so as to assist our Catholic party, which through the presence of a legate will take greater courage and boldness.” 171 There was no longer any time to lose, and indeed even before receiving this letter Julius III ordered Morone to depart. 172 On the 15th the consistory discussed several problems he had raised. 173 On 3 March his instructions were dispatched to him by courier. 174

In setting out once more for Germany, Morone wished to be accompanied not only by Beccadelli 175 but also by the Jesuits Giacomo Laínez and Girolamo Nadal, *viri magnae eruditionis et probitatis*, 176 with whom during the journey he recalled Salmerón’s expulsion from Modena in 1543 and admitted that he had been wrong. 177 The nuncio Zaccaria Dolfin would later testify that he had “heard from these two good priests, both in Germany and in Rome, that Cardinal Morone was of the soundest doctrine.” 178 Yet his orthodoxy - in the past, if not in the present - was called into question by the invective Vergerio now launched with his customary coarseness against both Morone, eager to restore Germany to papal tyranny, and Pole, the cruel persecutor of the true faith in England. The former bishop of Capodistria poured every kind of charge and abuse upon them, and repeated them in another contemporary pamphlet in more measured but even more insinuating language, presenting the Milanese cardinal as identical to Pole in having first known and then persecuted the truth, and as someone from whom the same deceptions, hypocrisy, and impiety were to be expected. 179 Shortly before, in a letter to Bullinger dated 20 February 1555, he had described the Milanese cardinal as nothing more than Pole’s ape, 180 a judgment paradoxically identical to that of Paul IV.

On 18 February 1555, from Antwerp, Cardinal Granvelle informed Morone of the emperor’s satisfaction at his “most prudent and excellent choice” and outlined a lucid picture of the German situation. It also suggested a political course consistent with the Milanese cardinal’s old and never abandoned conviction that the first necessity was a clergy prepared to face the immense challenge of restoring Germany to Catholicism, “since faith is not persuaded by force of arms, but by words, arguments, persuasion, and miracles.” 181 Morone, however, did not seem to hurry: on 4 March he was in Florence and on the 12th in Trent, despite the order to proceed “straight on his journey” 182 and despite Dolfin’s optimism from Augsburg about the turn affairs were taking at the diet, where everyone seemed “wonderfully inclined to do as England has done and reject false opinions and heresies,” as he wrote on 16 March. Dolfin therefore advised abandoning both reform and council and instead sending Germany a great quantity of “missals, breviaries, antiphonaries, ceremonials, pontificals, and rationals,” since they were almost impossible to find “after that traitor Martin Luther publicly burned some of them.” With astonishing bravado, he proposed that Rome impose upon the great number of priests who, in his view, were preparing to return to the bosom of Holy Church a penance of one scudo every time they needed to use the holy oils, convinced that such a simoniacal solution could easily be put into practice. “I therefore hope that, where the Apostolic See has suffered shame, expense, and losses, it can now recover by this means and draw half a million gold pieces a year. And much good may it do her!” he concluded. 183

Morone took a very different view. A few months later Muzzarelli in Brussels would recall the “little hope” with which he had arrived at Augsburg. 184 As is well known, the diet ultimately approved the principle *cuius regio, eius religio*, which in practice sanctioned official recognition of the Lutheran confession and of the massive secularizations of ecclesiastical property carried out up to that date. Morone, however, could not take part in these decisions, which would in fact guarantee Germany more than half a century of relative religious peace, because just after reaching Augsburg he received news of Julius III’s death in Rome on 23 March, bringing to an end what Seripando called a “brief pontificate, and in other respects not a very fortunate one.” 185 The Sacred College informed him that same day, 186 although by then he had not yet formally entered the city. 187 Three days later he wrote from there to Innocenzo Del Monte to report his first conversation with King Ferdinand, depicting a situation very different from Dolfin’s recent rosy account: “It seems to me that the least evil that can be done is to do nothing at all, and rather to let things collapse of themselves than to make them collapse by authority and public decrees.” 188

But the news from Rome that Pope Julius III was now *laborabat in extremis* raised other and more urgent questions. On 28 March Morone wrote to Pole urging him to come to Italy at once, “since your presence is so necessary and indeed obligatory for the election of a good successor, whose need in these times is plain to see,” just as he and Truchsess were preparing to do. His words eloquently foreshadowed what would happen in the conclave: 189

> God must have great mercy upon us, because we deserve *regem in furore*, since no good thing has ever been put into effect. […] I have been in great doubt whether I should go to Rome or remain somewhere in Italy until the new pope is elected, in case this one should be dead. *Tandem*, it has seemed safer for my conscience to expose myself to every sort of trouble, distress, and danger than to fail in my calling. But if along the way I were to hear that the matter had already been settled, I promise Your Most Illustrious Lordship that I would be very glad. When I remember the last conclave, *totus horreo, sed fiat voluntas Domini in cuius manu sunt omnia* [I shudder all over, but let the will of the Lord be done, in whose hand are all things].

On the 29th the pope’s death was confirmed, and Morone therefore added in a postscript: “God willing, tomorrow or at the latest the following day, very early, I shall depart for Rome.” By 3 April he had already reached Innsbruck, from where he asked the duke of Mantua to have a boat ready for him. 190 He would not arrive in Rome until 13 April, too late to participate in the entry into conclave on the 5th, after Julius III’s “most impoverished” funeral ceremonies, made so by the exhaustion of the papal treasury. 191 He also arrived too late to take part on the evening of the 8th in the very rapid election by adoration of Marcellus II. 192 It was yet another defeat for the imperial party, caused in part by the absence of Pole and Morone, since matters might have gone differently had at least one of them been present, Juan Manrique de Lara wrote to Charles V on 19 April. 193

Chapter Fifteen

“Heresy Must Be Persecuted with Every Severity and Harshness”: Paul IV and the Triumph of the Holy Office

1. From Marcellus II to Paul IV

Marcello Cervini’s candidacy for the papal throne immediately appeared among the strongest. On 6 April 1555, after the doors of the Sistine Chapel had been closed, Averardo Serristori praised his “very reserved” conduct, observing that he had “behaved with infinite modesty, since nothing could ever be discerned in his words except the desire to see a good pope.” On the 8th, however, Serristori deplored the divisions and rivalries within the Sacred College, which threatened to prolong matters “for an infinitely long time.” 1 His name was also mentioned by the papal nuncio in Naples, Pietro Camaiani, in a letter to Seripando dated 22 March: “The cardinals who have publicly begun to be most spoken of for the papacy are Santa Croce, Fano, England, Morone, and Puteo, although it is feared that there will be great discord and division among all the cardinals.” 2 The information Augusto Cocciano sent him on the 27th was not very different: “In my judgment the true papabili are few, while the aspirants are many: by papabili I mean those luminous and illustrious persons distinguished by their virtues, such as Santa Croce, Pole, and Morone; by aspirants, those who seek the office, and I see that few do not aspire to it.” 3 The possibility that the Milanese cardinal himself might emerge from the conclave wearing the tiara was also raised by Camillo Capilupi, who wrote to Ercole Gonzaga on 30 March stressing how his distance from Rome harmed both him and, above all, Pole. 4

At first the pro-imperial candidacy of Pietro Bertano seemed to have some prospect of success. He would have prevailed, a Mantuan agent wrote, had Álvarez de Toledo and Carafa not assailed him with “a thousand false accusations […] of Lutheranism and other things,” adding that the Theatine had even brought into conclave “a bundle of trials against him and all the papal candidates.” 5 The pro-French faction proposed Ippolito d’Este, disliked by many Italians because of his princely rank. His opponents finally united around the cardinal of Santa Croce, and with him a man of considerable learning and political experience ascended the throne of Peter, 6 renowned as a rigorous reformer, although his conduct at Trent, especially during the transfer to Bologna, had earned him Charles V’s undying political and personal hatred. 7 His success, as has rightly been observed, “in the eyes of most people did not consecrate a man of the Inquisition, but rather an heir to that season of reforms - always invoked and invariably frustrated - which contemporaries believed expressed Cervini’s most authentic aspirations.” 8 Considered by many a man of exemplary life, as Juan Manrique de Lara wrote on 13 April, Marcellus II was in Ercole Gonzaga’s judgment “the exact opposite of Pope Julius, who had brought matters to such a state that one can clearly see God has given us this pope out of pity for His Church.” 9

The fact remains that the Inquisition once again assumed a leading role in the conclave. This time it did not limit itself to exercising a veto over certain candidates, but succeeded in securing the election of its own, Cervini, who had aligned himself with Carafa after abandoning the independent strategy that likewise aimed to exclude Pole and Morone from the papacy. 10 Alongside his reputation as an austere, learned, and pious man, it was probably this *ralliement* that earned him the support of the Theatine cardinal, dean of the Sacred College, making him not only the candidate of the king of France but also that of the Holy Office. It is therefore unsurprising that Cocciano, after writing to Seripando on 10 April of Carafa’s delight, 11 informed him three days later that Carafa had been “the first to urge the others and lead them to the chamber of the most reverend Santa Croce, and then into the chapel to seat him in the papal chair.” 12 For his part, Pope Marcellus II immediately gave Carafa “rooms in the palace,” saying that he was prepared to surrender his own “to make room for so great a man.” He issued restrictive measures against the Jews and expressed the intention of extending the inquisitors’ jurisdiction to sodomy. 13 Among his first acts of government was the revival of the bull on reforming the conclave that Julius III had failed to promulgate. He submitted it to the examination of about ten cardinals, among them Morone, who was also appointed to the congregation

responsible for Rome’s grain supply. 14 This is too little on which to judge a pontificate that had filled Seripando with hope 15 but lasted barely three weeks, or to speculate on the role the Milanese cardinal might have played in it. Massarelli lamented the loss of “so great a shepherd” before he had been able to prove himself, 16 while Paolo Manuzio wondered why “so virtuous a prince, so holy in his creation, so necessary to heal the afflicted parts not only of religion but of the whole world, should within the space of one month be taken from us,” leaving the faithful “in a thick fog of errors and miseries.” 17

The sudden death of Marcellus II, before he could make any cardinalatial appointments, unexpectedly reopened the political game that had just been concluded and once more arrayed the Holy Office in the struggle to impose its choices. This time Morone was present, fully aware that it was precisely during vacancies of the Holy See that the supreme tribunal of the faith could exercise its power with greatest unscrupulousness, in the absence of any counterweight or control from papal authority. There can be no doubt that after the sensational Bartoli trial he now understood that he, as well as Pole, would become the target of inquisitorial thunderbolts. Pole was obliged to remain in England - and perhaps was happy to do so - while his name again appeared in the newsletters as that of the most authoritative candidate for the tiara. Morone therefore tried in some way to protect himself, if we are to believe the startling report made in 1560 by the Dominican Tommaso Stella, known as the Todeschino, then bishop of Capodistria and renowned as a relentless persecutor of heretics. In a deposition in Morone’s defense given on 30 January 1560, Stella stated that after Pope Marcellus II’s death and before the entry into conclave - thus within the brief period between 1 and 15 May 1555 - Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla had asked him to express an opinion on Morone’s religious views. Along with other members of the Sacred College, Mendoza was ready to vote for him, though with some doubts “because of a certain rumor that someone seemed to have spread.” Hence his decision to consult Stella, also because he was “a familiar of His Most Reverend Lordship in connection with pious works” and could better than anyone resolve their doubts. Stella would say that he replied that he had no doubts about Morone’s orthodoxy - which was not true - and suggested that, “to shut the mouths of the malicious,” Mendoza obtain a written attestation of Morone’s faith from some Jesuit father, to be placed alongside the statement Stella himself would deliver shortly thereafter. With the guarantee of two theologians of unquestioned Catholic orthodoxy, Mendoza could thus “show in conclave the testimony to the religious doctrine and life of the most reverend Lord Cardinal Morone.” Stella finally claimed to have learned that his attestation had been read in conclave, although he could report nothing of the reactions or comments it provoked. 18 This was an altogether anomalous episode, difficult to believe were it not confirmed by the already cited memorial drawn up by Cardinal Mendoza himself at Toledo on 5 March 1560. There he stated that on the eve of the 1555 conclave certain Jesuits and others who had previously held a very poor opinion of the Milanese cardinal declared themselves convinced of his full adherence to the conciliar decrees and signed a statement to that effect. 19 Whatever may actually have occurred, the scant surviving documentation is eloquent testimony to the atmosphere in Rome during those weeks between one conclave and the next, amid the tangle of political and religious tensions accumulated over the preceding years.

Marcellus II died on 1 May 1555, and his funeral rites were celebrated between the 6th and the 14th. On the 15th, forty-three of the fifty-six living cardinals entered conclave and elected the new pontiff in only eight days, 20 disproving fears that the “seraglio” would last a long time. That was the word used by the bishop of Reggio Emilia, Giovan Battista Grossi, conclavist to Ercole Gonzaga, who kept the latter’s brother Don Ferrante informed of events in Rome. Far from understanding the real alignments and balance of power within the Sacred College, on 16 May Grossi declared himself convinced that the name destined to prevail, or at least to have “a very great part in this papacy, unless absence deprives him of it,” was Pole, who “is desired by all for his many virtues.” 21 The king of France himself was not hostile to Pole’s candidacy, believing, as he wrote on 9 April 1555, that no one was more worthy of election. 22 This opinion was widespread in Rome and the newsletters spread it throughout Europe, from Madrid to Paris and from Vienna to London by way of Calais. There, on 31 May 1555, when the Theatine cardinal had already been Pope Paul IV for more than a week, an informant wrote that the four strongest candidates were Pole, Carafa, Morone, and Bertano, adding that according to the Roman newswriters the first was clearly in the lead. 23 Some thought Ercole Gonzaga too might have a chance, and Ippolito Capilupi therefore repeatedly urged him to

hurry to Rome, if only to avoid losing “the authority you possess in this court, for as you know, most of the friendships one has here are founded upon interest in the papacy. Thus, if your friends see that you do not seek the papacy for yourself and do not wish to help any of them with your presence and authority, they will think little of your friendship.” 24 On 4 May Capilupi had written that the cardinal of Mantua had “so great a part in the papacy that perhaps no cardinal has a greater one”; on the 9th he presented a rather different picture: 25

The general opinion is that the cardinal of Naples can more easily become pope than anyone else, being nearly eighty years old. After him Cardinal Morone is held in great consideration, and the imperial party is making many efforts on his behalf. Next, the most reverend cardinal of England is much spoken of; if he were present, it is believed that he would have a greater share in the papacy than anyone else. On the bankers’ market Naples is quoted at twenty-five scudi per hundred, Morone at twenty, and England at fifteen, and it is thought that the conclave will be long.

Those percentages were destined to rise further, although Bernardino Pia wrote to Mantua on the 18th with some skepticism that “the negotiations for Morone have grown very intense since this evening, and at the banks his notes have risen to forty; it is thought that tomorrow morning we shall have him as pope.” 26 His candidacy therefore appeared very strong - “he has all the imperial votes without exception,” people deluded themselves 27 - not only because of the powerful support he could command, being “highly regarded by the emperor,” but also because of his own political and intellectual stature. This was known even in a city as distant from him as Naples, where “many thought he would be pope and considered him a great man, […] a Catholic and a great cardinal,” as Camaiani would later state. 28 On 3 May 1555 Camaiani wrote to Seripando that “in Rome the person of the most reverend Cardinal Morone is beginning to command the greatest expectation and the voice of the public, and his virtue and goodness are very well known to Your Most Reverend Lordship, although his being almost one and the same individual as the cardinal of England makes them equally well known to everyone.” He added that Bertano was no longer mentioned, “because of an ugly bell hung around his neck,” alluding to the accusations of heresy directed against him in the previous conclave. Twenty days later he again mentioned the “objections” against Bertano: “his greatest persecutors are among his own friars of Saint Dominic, and Cardinal San Giacomo [Juan Álvarez de Toledo] in particular has defamed him with ugly charges.” 29

Among the candidates indicated by Charles V, Morone thus remained in the front rank. Already on 4 May a Roman informant reported that he was advancing “vigorously” thanks to Farnese support and that even the French would vote for him to avoid something worse. 30 Five days later an anonymous *Extract from a Letter from Rome* presented him as a person “of most exemplary life, loved, esteemed, and judged most suitable for this great administration because of his learning, prudence, and experience in public affairs, in which he has been engaged since youth.” Added to this was “the favor of Don Giovanni Manrique and the imperial party,” to the point that what created some difficulty was precisely “the excessive support he has from the said imperialists.” 31 On 11 May Ottavio Farnese was informed that “Morone is in good repute and many entertain the greatest hopes for him, especially the imperialists.” 32 Camaiani likewise believed “that the greatest support rests with Cardinal Morone, although some object that he is too imperial,” as he informed Seripando on the 16th. 33 This was indeed the conclave in which Morone had his best chances, before the trial brought against him by Paul IV barred him forever from the papacy.

Yet it was not so much the Milanese cardinal’s explicit political alignment that prevented his election, to which for a moment he seemed extremely close, 34 as the profound fractures within the Sacred College: the ambitions and resentments of those who felt unjustly excluded from the contest, the conflicts festering there and spilling over into personal relations, and above all the rivalries and enmities within the imperial party and the profoundly different religious options that now divided it. Its members included Spanish cardinals such as Juan Álvarez de Toledo and Italians such as Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, who combined their old Habsburg loyalty with the orthodox rigorism that had led them to help direct the Roman Holy Office alongside Gian Pietro Carafa. Grossi’s letters to Don Ferrante Gonzaga repeatedly stressed the conflicts within the pro-Habsburg faction, divided between the cardinal of Mantua and Bertano, who in turn were opponents of

Carpi. The latter managed to secure only eleven votes despite Morone's support, which many judged highly ambiguous and offered merely "with the design that Carpi would return it to him when he needed it." 35

2. "Fists, Kicks, and Sticks Were Used in the Conclave"

Finally, on 23 May, preceded by a sudden "commotion at the banks" skillfully manipulated by Florentine merchants, and "contrary to common opinion," 36 the man elected under the name Paul IV was precisely the "ambitious Theatine," as Cardinal Otto Truchsess called him. Truchsess was not alone in fearing the elevation of that "old man […] so much feared that everyone proceeds cautiously in deciding," as a letter from Rome had put it on 6 April. 37 If Grossi thus seemed to have understood little of the situation, Pietro Camaiani had understood still less. On that same 23 May, unaware of the election, he wrote to Seripando that the candidacies of Carafa - still "in the expectation of the public" - and Morone - "of whom most people said that within two days he would be proclaimed pope" - continued to face difficulties, to the point that he judged "the cardinal of England much closer to the papacy." 38

In reality Carafa had appeared from the outset the strongest contender for the tiara to those able to see without remaining prisoners of the patterns of the past. Most people thought he would be elected pope, the imperial postmaster Giovanni Antonio von Taxis, who was then present, wrote to his friend Andreas Masius on 5 May. Yet Taxis remained convinced that, had Pole been in Rome, God would have assigned the tiara to him, while Morone's hopes depended entirely on the pro-imperial party. For his own part, however, he feared that the conclave would produce one of the usual disappointing pontiffs. 39 "Theatine is spoken of more than all the others," the Umbrian man of letters Dionigi Atanagi had written on the very day of Pope Marcellus's death. "England, who would have a great party, is far away," he added, "and since popes in these times are created by adoration rather than scrutiny, it seems difficult for him to succeed." 40 In a letter to Seripando of 18 May, Cocciano declared himself convinced that "if the choice moves away from Naples," the papacy might "fall even to Friar Stopino." 41

Carafa had the support of Alessandro Farnese and his many followers, as well as that of several members of the imperial camp. He did not hesitate to draw upon the now well-tested arsenal of inquisitorial documentation he had been gathering for years, to the point that he could bring into conclave, as we have seen, "a bundle of trials against […] all the papal candidates." 42 Already on 26 April, even before entering the Sistine Chapel, Cardinal Jean du Bellay believed that Pole's candidacy would encounter even greater obstacles than before because of an earlier heresy trial whose records were in the hands of the cardinals of the Holy Office. 43 On 9 May the anonymous author of the already cited *Extract from a Letter from Rome*, while emphasizing the hostility toward Morone of the "old cardinals of the Inquisition," reported the spread of "a very impious rumor" according to which "Cardinal Morone and the cardinal of England were once denounced before the most reverend inquisitors," and that there existed many indications against them that had hitherto been kept hidden. Hence the widespread opinion that Carafa "will easily become pope, being so venerable an old man and much loved by those leading cardinals mentioned above, who are not greatly inclined toward Morone." 44 Two of the most authoritative pro-Habsburg cardinals justified their disobedience to Charles V's instructions - he had vetoed Carafa - "by saying that they could not fail in the particular friendship they had with him, since they had always been companions in the office of the Holy Inquisition." 45 Shortly afterward Giovanni Agostino Fanti reported to Beccadelli that "those of the Inquisition are attacking Pole and Morone on account of heresy, and although their supporters have labored greatly to defend them, it is feared that merely putting the matter in dispute will suffice to prevent them. It is said that Carpi is the head of these malicious men and that, if he himself cannot prevail, he wishes at least that Chieti should, promising himself that he will then govern this old man in his own fashion." 46 Cardinal Carpi was indeed in the front line in opposing both candidacies. He stated bluntly that "his conscience resisted" and brought into the conclave documented charges of heresy against Pole, Morone, and Bertano, which sufficed to exclude their election. In this he acted in complete agreement with Carafa and Álvarez. 47 Considering that Carpi, Álvarez, Pole, Morone, and secondarily Bertano were precisely those whom Charles

V had designated as his candidates, it is hardly surprising that the victor of that conclave should have been the Theatine cardinal, the fiercest and most feared enemy of the house of Austria.

Against England, a Roman newsletter of 17 May reported, 48 several are said to have moved, and Carpi first of all, who has boldly undertaken the campaign against him. Not only do they revive those matters of the Inquisition that circulated during Julius's conclave, but they add still more, and the said Carpi works diligently on his own behalf, although he pretends to favor Chieti. […] It is also understood that he acts against Morone on the same inquisitorial grounds.

The imperial cardinals tried in vain to prevent Carafa's election. No fewer than seventeen electors remained united in supporting Puteo's candidacy *in extremis*, until they surrendered and joined the twenty-seven Frenchmen "who were with Naples." They were preceded not only, and predictably, by Carpi and Álvarez, but also by Morone, as Cocciano wrote to Seripando with bitter irony that very day: "Long live glorious Naples! And may Your Most Reverend Lordship be content to have such a pontiff, formerly so great a friend of yours and now your lord." 49 The Milanese cardinal was therefore among the first to understand that the game was over and his own candidacy finished. He even took it upon himself to inform the imperialists that the Theatine cardinal's accession to the papal throne was now a settled fact and to persuade them to accept it willingly. This, of course, did not alter by a hair the newly elected pontiff's established opinion of him, as Giovanfrancesco Lottini, secretary to Cosimo de' Medici, took care to explain, judging that last-minute change of sides entirely useless, if not counterproductive. 50

In the *confessio* drafted after his arrest, Morone would try to offer as proof of his "good disposition […] in religion" the fact that he had always been determined, both before and after entering conclave, to favor Carafa's election "for the service of God and out of affection […] for His Holiness's rare virtues," something he would never have done had he possessed "a corrupt mind in matters of religion." 51 Conscious, moreover, of the sword of Damocles that had long hung above his head, after Paul IV's election he repeatedly sought an audience to inform him that he was prepared "to say frankly everything I could remember." 52 Federici would state in 1560 that five years earlier he had learned from Cardinal Pacheco "that it had been said in conclave that Cardinal Morone was a heretic or suspect," and that he had been authorized to report the matter to the Milanese cardinal. Although many advised him against it, Morone had wished to discuss it with the new pontiff, "begging him to have an investigation made." 53 According to Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, it was Pope Carafa who, immediately after the conclave, told Morone "with great charity that it would be well for him to purge himself and not remain so gravely accused before the Inquisition as he now is." 54

The explosive mixture of personal rivalries and more or less sincere, and more or less ostentatious, inquisitorial militancy that had formed within the pro-Habsburg party brought about its complete political *débâcle*. Once again the emperor had to absorb a defeat and witness the elevation of one of his enemies to the tiara, demonstrating the success the Holy Office had by now achieved in dismantling established political logics with the crowbar of accusations of heresy. An account of the *Conclave of Pope Paul IV* attributed the choice to the cardinals' divisions. They elected a pontiff "whom many of them hated little less than death, not because they and everyone else did not consider him good, but because it was universally believed that he joined to his goodness so great a severity that no one thought he could fall into even a small error without punishment." 55 The day after the election, a cardinal reported to Charles V the saying that "the nature of this pope is never to forgive," 56 and as late as 1563 the Venetian ambassador would remember him as "the most hated and feared cardinal […] who has ever existed in our times." 57 Then dean of the Sacred College, strengthened by his reputation as a severe reformer and as "a man of intellect, learning, and goodness" who had always "professed to be devout and religious," 58 he effectively prevailed without a rival, unanimously and without any opposition, as Massarelli wrote. 59 His extreme age also helped his election - "the cunning Theatine | can play the old man," it had been insinuated on the eve 60 - prompting Cornelio Musso to urge him to take care of himself, "for the pear is ripe and there is little oil in the lamp." 61 Paul IV did indeed sit on the throne for little more than four years, but that was enough to impose a decisive turn upon papal policy, marked by an overbearing assertion of his authority expanded to an ideological paroxysm fraught with grave dangers for the Apostolic See itself.

A letter Agostino Gonzaga addressed to Sabino Calandra on the fateful 23 May 1555 offered an effective summary of what had happened by reporting the words of Juan Manrique de Lara, who “did not believe it and did not want him [Paul IV] until this morning before lunch and after lunch, and spoke publicly against him, saying: ‘We do not want him, neither cooked nor raw’; and yet he will have to eat him!” Gonzaga concluded, vowing never again to persuade the cardinal of Mantua to return to Rome even if “a thousand popes should die.” 62 For his part Manrique could only chew bitterness and swallow his anger against “Carpi and San Giacomo, who, paying no heed to His Majesty’s exclusion of Naples, were the first to rally to him in company with Ippolito d’Este and the other Frenchmen who made him pope.” Other cardinals then joined them, including Morone, “and all knew that His Majesty did not want him.” 63 Camaiani likewise had no doubt in attributing that resounding failure to “the lack of unity and trust among these lord imperial cardinals.” 64 Manrique could do nothing but vent his anger in a letter to Charles V on 24 May, asking to be recalled from the embassy because he did not feel able to face a third vacancy of the Holy See at the mercy of Carpi and Álvarez de Toledo. 65 Other pro-Habsburg cardinals - Cristoforo Madruzzo, 66 Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla, 67 and Pedro Pacheco 68 - attacked the two men in similar letters. Pacheco emphasized their fierce opposition to Pole and Morone, stating that the two had publicly declared that they would never, for any reason, vote for either man because they were suspected of Lutheran heresy. It had been useless to reply that they were instead good Catholics, that precisely for this reason the Catholic king supported their candidacies, that it was highly distasteful for such accusations to emerge only during papal elections, and that in the end they were difficult to believe, since under Julius III the very same Carpi and Álvarez de Toledo had approved sending Pole to England and Morone to Germany to restore those countries to obedience to the Roman Church.

The following day, still furious, Manrique sent a longer and more detailed account of the clash in conclave. Álvarez and Carpi had refused to vote for Pole or Morone - in Manrique’s view, “the best man in the world” - saying that in conscience they could not do so because they knew the two were heretics. Denying that these slanders had any plausible foundation, the imperial ambassador lashed out in fiery language against both Carpi, his old adversary, and Álvarez, who always opposed the king’s choices and was ready to accuse of being no Christian anyone who might hinder his own ambitions for the papacy. 69 Cardinal Pacheco likewise informed the emperor that there had been no way to persuade the two to vote for Pole and Morone. 70 Morone himself, writing that same 25 May, wisely refrained from useless reproaches and urged Charles V to avoid heated tones and frontal conflict, to be prudent and patient, because like it or not this man was now pope, “of good life and learning, but decrepit rather than merely old.” 71

That same day one of the two cardinals under accusation, Juan Álvarez de Toledo, sent Charles V his own account of the disturbing affair. Conscious of the responsibility being attributed to him, he nevertheless confined himself to the political negotiations within the Sacred College and blamed what had happened on Manrique’s mistakes. Above all he assured the emperor that the newly elected pontiff was the best possible choice, an example of goodness, Christian faith, zeal, learning, and every other virtue. 72 Cardinal Carpi was far more explicit. Called upon by Charles V to justify his conduct, in July he sent the imperial court a memorial setting out his version of events. Besides expressing bitter resentment at not having been adequately supported - indeed, at having been sabotaged in the political struggle for the tiara and passed over not only by Morone but also by Puteo - he addressed the accusations against him. He did not deny having acted as charged; rather, he insisted that the suspicions of heresy concerning Pole and Morone which he had denounced in conclave rested on solid evidence. He therefore wished to explain without reticence the reasons of “conscience” he had invoked to prevent their election. Carpi was able to speak of these suspicions as a member of the Holy Office, and in that capacity he had seen the denunciations and read the heresy proceedings long since opened against the two cardinals: 73

He never failed […] to proceed with his customary modesty toward unity in the service of Their Majesties, until by sheer force and craft, in order to use it against him, he was compelled to say why he did not give his vote to those to whom it was well known that in conscience he could not give it - whether this is true or not can now very easily be clarified. And because some say, “Why wait until such a moment to bring forward such things?” they must know that, besides the need to avoid the scandal of defaming cardinals except to avert a greater scandal,

such as making one of them pope, the office of the Inquisition is also forbidden to proceed against cardinals without the pope's express commission. Hence in the past many things against the cardinal of England and Morone have remained hidden, although already in the time of Pope Paul of holy memory they were such as to move His Holiness to rebuke the cardinal of England for sinister opinions and methods he adopted in such matters; and it is believed that he did the same with Morone. All this was once unknown to the cardinal of Carpi, and for that reason in Julius's conclave he continued to give his vote to the aforesaid two men. But after becoming an inquisitor he learned what caused him to change his opinion, as he has charitably told Morone himself to his face whenever necessary, and would have said earlier had Pope Julius not thought otherwise in order to avoid scandal and because of a certain innate weakness of his - something that nevertheless ought not to have been concealed in a matter of such importance and danger.

This affair makes it possible to measure the full weight assumed by the Roman Inquisition in producing profound political and religious realignments at the summit of the Church during those decisive years. It was no accident that Carafa had succeeded in placing imperial cardinals such as Carpi, Álvarez, and Verallo at the head of the Holy Office, intending to weaken their political loyalty through a new doctrinal logic. Beyond the personal rivalries and enmities that Manrique had also noted, it was precisely the existence of very different religious orientations within the pro-Habsburg party that shattered its political unity, leaving it completely disarticulated and incapable of coherent action. On the eve of Charles V's abdication and the division of his dominions, with Germany's religious fracture now sanctioned at the Diet of Augsburg and all hope of compromise with the Reformation gone, that party was losing its very reason for existence, while in Rome the intransigents were now able to deliver the coup de grâce to their opponents.

On the very day of Carafa's election, Camillo Olivo, Ercole Gonzaga's conclavist, wrote of it to his friend Sabino Calandra with resentful bitterness: "His election was such that it is less bad to remain silent about it, or to tell it orally, than to write it down, […] and the matter passed with great tumult, not without scandal to lovers of the good and danger of schism." 74 Two days later Cocciano deplored the fact that the new pontiff had been elected "almost *per vim et metum*: fists, kicks, and sticks were used in the conclave." 75 In an account of the conclave Onofrio Camaiani wrote that "his affair was like embers beneath ashes, suddenly uncovered," and that the "impetus" with which he seized the tiara "was an unusual thing and smacked of violence, against which […] there was not the resistance that could and should have been made, since it is lawful *vim vi repellere*." 76

There was in fact some attempt of that kind, though only after the new pontiff's coronation. Manrique and several imperial cardinals, including Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora, decided to send Lottini in great secrecy to Charles V's court, 77 charged with personally delivering letters that described the just-concluded conclave as a tangle of unprecedented abuses, intimidation, "confusion and fraud," during which certain cardinals had allegedly been "forcibly imprisoned." On Lottini's return to Rome in July 1555, perhaps with the emperor's silent approval, the threads of a conspiracy to kill the pope began to be woven. It allegedly involved the Spanish ambassador, agents of several Italian princes, some cardinals, and representatives of the Roman nobility, among them Camillo and Marcantonio Colonna, proud to count among their family's glories the sackings of Rome in 1526-27. Arrested shortly afterward, Lottini confessed under torture that this conspiracy to "strike the pope with steel or poison" had the support of the Spanish sovereigns, several authoritative cardinals, Cosimo de' Medici, and other Italian princes. 78

Everything was now plunging into the whirlpool of the anti-Habsburg war that Paul IV had begun preparing from the first moment in order to give vent to his inveterate hatred of Spain. In August 1555 the Florentine ambassador Averardo Serristori portrayed him as a pontiff always ready to fly into a rage, to shout "that popes who are afraid are heretics" and "that His Holiness wished to be obeyed or to ruin the world." "Your Excellency may believe," he wrote, "that this is a man of steel, and that the stones he touches become fire to destroy and burn everything that exists whenever his will is not done." 79

3. “He Is Vehement in Conducting Every Affair”

With the elevation of Pope Carafa to the tiara (plate 2), tenaciously prepared over the preceding decades, a political project first outlined after the Sack of Rome reached fulfillment. It had gradually taken shape in the foundation of the Theatine Clerks Regular, the tasks of supervising and reforming the clergy entrusted to him by Clement VII, his participation in the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, and above all his struggle against heresy. Awareness of his advanced age helps explain the impetuosity with which, after winning the tiara, he strove to realize the ambitious program already set out in the “great memorial” sent to Rome in 1532. It rested on the premise that the clergy’s moral laxity and the spread of transalpine doctrines were two sides of the same coin, and that reform of the Church must therefore aim first of all at an uncompromising struggle against every form of heterodoxy, without indulgence or compromise. 80 For this reason, despite his considerable learning, he had in the past regarded with open hostility Paul III’s promotion of men of letters to the Sacred College, declaring against Bembo that there was “no need of men who know how to write sonnets.” 81 Nor had he concealed his hostility toward the council - which indeed he took care not to reconvene during his pontificate 82 - toward Contarini’s irenicism, and above all toward those treacherous spirituali clothed in purple who, thanks to imperial support, had brought heresy within a step of the tiara. Hence Paul IV’s furious anti-Habsburg hostility, rooted in the resentment of Spanish rule felt by the great aristocratic house from which he descended and later nourished by his proud sense of belonging to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and by his self-presentation as the bulwark of the faith against the Protestant threat. In Morone’s case that hostility was probably reinforced by the fact that his father, Girolamo Morone, had directed the repression of the Neapolitan aristocracy opposed to Spanish rule, including the Acquaviva, Caracciolo, Carafa, and Sanseverino families, earning a reputation as “a proud and avaricious man.” 83

He would devote all his energy until death to the primary duty of fighting heretics, and from this perspective his election - energetically secured by wielding the inquisitorial hammer against every rival - was nothing other than the final outcome of a project pursued for thirty years. Yet the disastrous results of his reign, which ultimately descended into a kind of blind fanaticism from which the tiara seemed to remove every restraint, have obscured the stature of a figure who, however one judges him, left a profound mark upon the Church and upon the way it understood itself, its religious and political role, and its pastoral tasks. Menacing and solemn, the statue surmounting his funerary monument in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, commissioned by Pius V (plate 2), conveys with extraordinary force Pope Carafa’s impetuous and willful character, his overbearing vehemence, his intolerance of every limit, and his iron determination. 84 He was, without doubt, the first truly Counter-Reformation pope.

It is hardly surprising that his ability to combine reforming commitment with personal ambition, ascetic rigor with the government of men and institutions, and religious devotion with political unscrupulousness nourished the accusations of hypocrisy that for decades accompanied the “Theatine fox, | wicked, insidious, iniquitous, and foul,” the “rascally Theatine | who would deceive Christ and saints both male and female,” the “solemn inventor of hypocrisies.” His ostentatious contrition, “twisting his neck,” and doctrinal intransigence as an “inquisitor | of motes and vine leaves” were said to be nothing but the mask he used to conceal his lust for power. 85 “*A chietina sanctitate libera nos Domine*,” the exile Francesco Negri had prayed in the *Tragedy of Free Will*, judging Carafa “a creature of Lady Hypocrisy and endowed by her with satanic holiness,” to the point that “he would give his soul and his body even to the devil for the papacy.” 86 But the widespread stereotype of the “hypocrite, wicked and fraudulent, | born to deceive all humankind: | far from believing in the Son, he scarcely believes in the Father,” 87 of the pious religious man occupied with prayers and good works but in reality always absorbed “in profound meditation upon the golden cross on his slippers,” as Giovio had already sneered in 1540, 88 failed to grasp that his poorly concealed desire for the papacy arose from the conviction that his projects could be realized only from above and from a position of strength. It reflected a conception of the Church consistent with the fiery and overbearing nature of that Neapolitan baron who in youth had tried to escape family discipline by becoming a Dominican, of that nephew of Cardinal Oliviero Carafa who had spent his whole life within the ecclesiastical hierarchy and

identified himself with it, of that authoritative and authoritarian prelate animated by an immeasurable sense of himself and of his mission to defend the faith and Roman primacy.

For this reason he wished the grand coronation of 26 May 1555, accompanied by “most splendid festivities and banquets never seen before,” 89 to make evident to everyone how he intended to interpret the rank of vicar of Christ on earth. He ordered court life to be marked by magnificence appropriate to the supreme dignity of the Church. Processions, distributions of coins to the people, artillery salutes, and fireworks accompanied the event in a festively decorated Rome, amid a jubilant crowd never weary of shouting “peace” and “abundance” toward the pontiff as he appeared to bless them. 90 Many felt they had never seen “such magnificence,” 91 and Massarelli recorded the pope’s desire that nothing be omitted in celebrating his election. On that occasion he granted every kind of grace and favor to those who asked, underlining that his moment had finally come. Paul IV ordered all his collaborators to conduct themselves in public and private in a manner befitting papal dignity, which he intended to preserve with the greatest magnificence in order to honor its majesty, authority, and universal primacy. If as a cardinal he had already lived “very pompously,” 92 once he possessed the tiara there was no sign of grandeur he was willing to forgo: the opulence of his table, the splendor of his relatives, the nobility and clothing of his courtiers, and the magnificence of the apartments, where he wanted everything to be regal and sumptuous. 93

Many were astonished that a pope renowned as an uncompromising reformer proved far from immune to nepotistic ambition. He bestowed the red hat, the archbishopric of Naples, and later the government of the Apostolic Camera upon the seventeen-year-old Alfonso Carafa; 94 showered his greedy relatives with honors, dignities, titles, and prebends, so that within a short time they became “cardinals, dukes, and marquises”; and even deluded himself that he could create a Carafa principality in the moribund republic of Siena and perhaps in the kingdom of Naples itself. In directing affairs of state he wanted beside him his nephew Carlo Carafa, described as a corrupt, blasphemous soldier, a vicious and unscrupulous man, and a murderous brigand. 95 To bring him into the Sacred College, Paul issued a brief absolving him of every kind of “robbery, sacrilege, theft, pillage, oppression, and violence, even when they involved wounds, mutilations, homicides, and any other crime and offense, even graver than those listed (should the list not suffice), perpetrated by him alone or with others.” 96 After Paul IV’s death, while emphasizing the uncontrollable family impulses of pontiffs, Alvise Mocenigo observed that he too had not hesitated “in order to favor his own blood to make a cardinal of a murderous soldier infamous for many reasons,” even though he wished “to be regarded as a saint and a God on earth for goodness and religion.” 97

In 1558, besides noting Pope Carafa’s choleric nature, boundless pride, and tendency to excess, Navagero emphasized the central place of the struggle against heresy in his designs. It was destined to override everything else, independently of every political consideration, as the inescapable divine mission entrusted to him. For no reason in the world would he relinquish the presidency of the Holy Office’s meeting, saying “many times that when he ceased doing this he would cease living,” as a newsletter of 16 September 1558 reported. 98 Even when Anagni fell in the summer of 1557, the duke of Alba’s army pressed at the gates of Rome, Marcantonio Colonna retook Paliano at the head of his troops, and “everyone stood in terror of losing property and life,” the pope remained “intrepid” in discussing trials *in causa fidei*: 99

> The temperament of this pontiff, Navagero wrote, is choleric and adust. He has incredible gravity and grandeur in all his actions, and truly seems born to command. […] He knows all of Holy Scripture by heart, and the commentators as well, but chiefly Saint Thomas. […] He is vehement in conducting every affair, so that he wishes no one to contradict him and takes offense whenever anyone, whoever he may be, opposes him. For besides the rank of the pontificate, which he says exists to place kings and emperors beneath his feet, knowing himself to be nobly born, endowed with so much knowledge, and possessed of a life that for so many years cannot be reproached in any respect, he is so magnanimous and holds the cardinals and others in so little esteem that he does not admit their counsel. Thus everyone judges it best to yield to the mere word of His Holiness. He is vehement, as I have said, in all his actions, but in the Inquisition he is most vehement of all, so that no greater offense can be given him than to recommend these accused persons to him.

“Heresy must be persecuted with every rigor and harshness, like the plague of the body,” he admonished on 30 April 1556, “because it is the plague of the soul.” 100 A severe religious repression then descended upon the whole peninsula. A broadsheet, perhaps originating with Vergerio, represented it through the image of a satanic pope whose tiara sprouted horns, encased in armor bearing a lion’s muzzle on the belly, a scimitar at his side, and a gigantic two-handed sword raised to strike, symbol of his “ferocity, […] cruelty, and terror.” 101 Henry II of France likewise called him “a terrible old man” who “forgives no one,” 102 and after his death Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, who had nevertheless supported him, described him as “a man of his own head, who thought he knew far more than he did, especially in matters of state, and was extraordinarily unmanageable and impetuous.” 103

A violent invective against Paul IV was entrusted by the imperial postmaster Giovanni Antonio von Taxis to a letter of 26 October 1555, warning the elector palatine against the warlike plans of a pontiff who wanted everything beneath his feet: 104

> No one can negotiate anything with the pontiff; he seems devoid of common sense; he does not base his arguments on reasonable grounds unless by chance he is free from partiality and favor, and then he abandons himself to puerile and womanish flatteries by which he seeks to obtain consent. […] His will is his reason; he uses radical methods to the point of obstinacy; very rarely does he accept compromises with which to nourish his vast designs; he is not always master of himself.

The pontiff himself, moreover, liked to say that “since God had placed him in that position, […] he would not fail with his hands, his feet, and his very life to preserve the dignity and obedience of this see.” 105 He had dedicated his life wholly and solely to the greatness of the Church, making it a sacred mission to be fought on both the religious front, through the strenuous defense of Catholic orthodoxy, and the political front, through the struggle against Charles V, who claimed mastery in Italy and had allowed heresies to spread with impunity. A few years later one of his most faithful followers, Cardinal Scipione Rebiba, would recall that “Paul IV, as one zealous for the Church, complained of the Sack of Rome and of the emperor and of the pragmatics issued in Spain concerning matters of the Church, […] because he was a great ecclesiastic.” 106 His longstanding hostility to the house of Austria, the pro-imperial orientations of the spirituali, the conviction that “truces would be the ruin of the world,” 107 and above all the premise that strengthening the papacy required absolute political independence from the great powers - especially the imperial power dominant in Italy - led him from his first day to act to free the peninsula from Habsburg hegemony. In early October 1555, during a conversation with the Venetian ambassador, he confided that he would consider himself “the most fortunate man in the world” if it pleased the divine Majesty “to drive these barbarians out of Italy” through his agency, from Naples as from Milan. 108 It is no surprise, then, that Pope Carafa’s reputation was execrable in Germany, where in 1557 a rumor even spread that he had asked Suleiman the Magnificent for support against the Empire, and that Vergerio prayed God to erase such a plague from the world. 109

4. “Seed of Jews and Marranos, Dregs of the World”: Paul IV’s Anti-Spanish War

A prisoner of his idiosyncrasies and phantoms, at times at the mercy of his nephews’ greed and double-dealing, the old pontiff went so far as to question the dynastic legitimacy of the Habsburg sovereigns and put them on trial, accusing them of complicity with heretics. Repeatedly in conversations with the Venetian ambassador he vented his resentments while waving the banner of the “liberty of Italy,” thundering that he would expel those who “tyrannically” occupied the kingdom of Naples and using fiery language against Charles V, “the enemy of Christ”: “We shall curse him, deprive him of all his kingdoms and states, of communion with men, together with all his descendants and all who assist and favor him, and we shall reduce him to such a state that *melius si natus non fuisset* [it would have been better for him not to have been born].” For Paul IV every pretext was good enough to rage against that “demon-possessed” emperor, that “iniquitous and wicked man,” “crippled in both body and soul,” Luther’s accomplice in “lowering this papacy,” “soulless, greedy for Christian blood, schismatic, born to ruin the world,” and against those impious Spaniards, a “cesspool of filth, a mixture of Jews, Moors, and Lutherans, who if they possess even a span of

land in Italy will disturb the whole country." 110 Anyone who tried to contradict him only intensified his anger against those "vassals" guilty of "felony," those "schismatics and heretics": "We shall move heaven and earth, overturn all the elements to avenge the injury done to God; we shall make a crusade against them, and we shall not regard as a good Christian anyone who thinks otherwise, nor as sons of the Church those who are not with us, whoever they may be." Navagero acutely grasped the causes that unleashed the pope's fury. He found it intolerable that those who "used to be cooks or stable boys in Italy now command": 111

> The first cause of the war was judged to be an aged hatred against the Spanish nation, and particularly against the emperor, because, as he told me, he had known him to be too covetous of what belonged to others and to have increased Martin Luther's errors in order to extinguish the pontiff's authority and by this means acquire what remained of Italy. […] All my letters are full of this greed of the emperor and his toleration of heretics, just as they are also full of the fact that he never spoke of His Majesty and the Spanish nation without calling them heretics, schismatics, and accursed by God, seed of Jews and marranos, dregs of the world, deploring Italy's misery in being forced to serve people so abject and vile. To this were added the particular offenses committed against him while cardinal: refusing for a long time to give him possession of the archbishopric of Naples, […] and commanding all dependent cardinals not to elect him pope.

By the tradition of his Neapolitan house, by his past experiences, and by the extravagant conception he had of himself and of the ecclesiastical dignity he represented, Paul IV had always "abhorred the name of the emperor and the Spanish nation." In them he saw the overbearing masters of Italian politics, capable of heavily constraining Rome's authority. The humiliation Charles V had inflicted upon Clement VII in 1527 had been atrocious; the pressure exerted upon Paul III to force him to accept the religious colloquies in Germany and convoke the council was intolerable; the open protection granted to cardinals such as Pole and Morone, tainted by heterodox doctrines, was fraught with danger; and the authority exercised throughout the peninsula was tyrannical. Hence his personal, political, and religious hostility to the Habsburgs prevailed over every appeal to prudence and realism, leading him into a disastrous conflict not without links and connections to the inquisitorial trial of the Milanese cardinal. As early as the second decade of the century, during the legation to England that took him to Flanders and Spain, Carafa had clashed with the young Charles, not yet emperor. Even then the Catholic king's court had placed obstacles in the path of his ecclesiastical career, 112 obstacles destined to reappear more than thirty years later in the refusal to accept his appointment to the archbishopric of Naples. 113 But it was above all the Sack of Rome, of which Carafa was both witness and victim together with his Theatines, that fused such personal and political aversions with his militant commitment to the struggle against heresy and his desire for a theocratic restoration of the Church's authority. For this reason, in the war he unleashed against the Habsburg sovereigns immediately after his election, politics and religion, vengeance and crusade, seemed almost to merge and shade into one another.

While Pole and Morone deluded themselves that they could persuade him that only peace would make possible the reform of the Church he had always advocated in the past, in June 1555 - one month after his election - the pope formally opened proceedings against them. Meanwhile he surrounded himself with pro-French collaborators and anti-Medici exiles, recruited troops, contemplated the conquest of Siena, and let it be understood that he had no intention of reconvening the Council of Trent or, worse, that he wished to assemble it in Rome. From the beginning of his pontificate he had opened hostilities by forcing the Orsini to surrender Bracciano, seizing the fiefs of the Colonna, the most faithful imperial vassals in the Papal States, against whom he would later thunder excommunication, and investing his nephew Giovanni Carafa with the title duke of Paliano and naming him captain general of the Church. 114 Nor did he hesitate to use a diplomatic incident as the occasion to imprison Cardinal Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora, nephew of Paul III, thus revealing his political objectives, which were made explicit in December 1555 by the signature of a defensive and offensive treaty with France. 115

"His Holiness does not cease to administer justice, no matter whom it touches," Morone wrote euphemistically to the faithful Filippo Gheri on 9 May 1556. His words betrayed helpless anxiety over what was happening in Rome, the winds of war, and perhaps also the inquisitorial clouds gathering over his head. "Would to God that I might withdraw to serve Him in my church of Novara *omnibus diebus vitae meae*: I

promise you that I would consider myself most fortunate." 116 The bishop of Fiesole, Braccio Martelli, was mistaken when, after arriving in Rome in October of that year and being immediately struck by the "many changes and innovations in things and men," he wrote to Seripando that he was convinced the pope did not wish to enter war but only to establish a reputation as a man unwilling to "tolerate injuries or […] carry anyone on his back." 117 In reality Paul was moving toward the frontal clash with the Habsburgs that he had always contemplated. As the situation progressively deteriorated, the isolation, distrust, and hostility surrounding the pro-imperial cardinals emerge from the bitter, though always cautious and often reticent, tone of Morone's correspondence. He was Charles V's chief confidant in the Sacred College, cardinal vice-protector of England, and protector of Germany, of which he remained the best-informed figure at the summit of the curia. This is confirmed by the fact that at the end of June 1555 he joined Carpi and Truchsess in drafting instructions for Alvise Lippomano, appointed nuncio to Poland, and in early January of the following year those for Zaccaria Dolfin, once again sent to Ferdinand of Habsburg. 118

Meanwhile the Lutheran confession was about to be formally recognized by the Diet of Augsburg. From there Dolfin informed Morone on 15 June that "affairs here are going badly," 119 while three months later Girolamo Muzzarelli reported the "most corrupt religious dispositions" poisoning the air. Increasingly disheartened by the turn of events, on 15 September the then nuncio at the Brussels court informed the Milanese cardinal that he had warned the pope "what temper the events in Rome produce among us." He assured Morone that he was willing to give his life in defense of papal authority, but did not conceal his conviction that a change of course was urgently necessary. 120 "Others will report to Your Most Illustrious Lordship the suspicions, mistrust, and worst reports circulating at these courts because of the actions in Rome, interpreted in such a manner that they were thought designed to offend these most Catholic Majesties; others will also tell of the labors and disturbances I have suffered," he wrote again on 3 October 1555. He emphasized the patience and mildness that Charles V and Philip II had always tried to display: the former now preparing to return to Spain after his abdication "to serve God and prepare himself for the calling of the next life," and the latter a veritable "angel from heaven in religion and government." 121

The situation would deteriorate further in the following weeks, with the pope wholly absorbed in preparing war while ceaselessly proclaiming to the four winds his desire for peace. In 1556 the imperial postmaster Giovanni Antonio von Taxis, the Spanish envoy Garcilaso de la Vega, and the pro-Habsburg Cardinal Fulvio Della Cornia all experienced papal prisons, while Cardinal Pacheco's palace was searched from top to bottom and the imperial ambassador left Rome. 122 A plan devised by Morone, with Carlo Carafa's consent, contemplating the restoration of Paliano to the Colonna and the assignment of the dying republic of Siena to the papal family, came to nothing. Morone himself advised that it be discussed informally and orally at the Brussels court, without saying anything to the pontiff, knowing well that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to conclude agreements with his consent. 123 It therefore required some courage that in that same year the twenty-year-old Girolamo Ragazzoni, future bishop of Novara and Bergamo and papal nuncio in France, dedicated to Morone his Italian translation of Cicero's *Philippics*, published by Paolo Manuzio in Venice. 124 Ragazzoni was a pupil of Carlo Sigonio, who in 1562 would likewise dedicate to the Milanese cardinal his *De dialogo*, praising "the universal role of his mission within the *res publica christiana*," 125 almost as if prophesying his election to the papacy.

Now wholly unrestrained and careless of the consequences of his words, the pontiff once again told the Venetian ambassador that he alone could guarantee peace between the sovereigns of France and Spain, with whom he had never formed any alliance, because he wanted them "as subjects and beneath these feet, as is fitting and as He who built this holy Church and placed us in this rank has willed." To reach this goal he was prepared "to die, ruin everything, and set fire to all four parts of the world." 126 The word thus passed inexorably to arms, and at the end of 1556 the duke of Alba's troops spread throughout Lazio and threatened a new sack of Rome. Morone addressed desperate appeals to Pole for an agreement, explaining that the pope was utterly resolved in his decisions and that driving him into a corner would only feed his intransigence, even if he had to resort to acts of radical rupture. 127 Unchecked, in February 1557 the pontiff opened a genuine trial against Charles V and his son, intending to legitimate the bull - never in fact published - by

which “Philip of Austria, son of evil, […] presumed king of Spain, following in his father’s footsteps and as though wishing to compete with him in wickedness and surpass him,” was declared perjured, rebellious, and schismatic, and therefore deprived of the feudal investiture of the kingdom of Naples. 128 On Good Friday of that year Paul IV omitted the traditional prayer of blessing for the emperor, while other proceedings struck illustrious pro-imperial barons and even Cosimo de’ Medici, without his knowledge, became the target of an extremely secret case brought by the Apostolic Treasury. 129

“I pray that He who is *rex pacificus* may inspire His Holiness and all the other princes to do His holy will and have compassion on the ruin of so many peoples, on religion, and on the evil customs spreading everywhere, disorders for which no ordinary remedy is possible without peace,” Morone wrote to Pole on 11 December 1556, apologizing for writing “so rarely.” 130 Bitterness and discouragement seep from the correspondence between the two cardinals. “New causes of suspicion and disturbance frequently arise,” the Milanese cardinal wrote, for example, on 4 January 1556, 131 worried by the “new rupture” that now appeared imminent, “seeing His Holiness utterly resolved not to look anyone in the world in the face,” he added at the end of March. 132 On 7 January it was Pole’s turn to communicate his “great distress” over events in Rome, especially because “the wicked here have not failed, and still do not fail, to seize the opportunity to malign and spread scandalous rumors.” He therefore hoped the pope would devote himself to “carrying out his holy designs for reform,” of which the whole Church stood in great need. 133 Morone reassured him on this point, although at times the content and tone of his letters to the English cardinal seem to reveal a justified suspicion that they were being monitored on the pontiff’s orders. Six months later, for example, on 9 June, when the excommunication thundered against the Colonna, the occupation of Paliano, and the dispatch of Cardinal Carlo Carafa to France to renew military and political understandings - postponed but not broken by the precarious Truce of Vaucelles concluded in February between Charles V and Henry II - revealed that armed conflict was now imminent, Morone again addressed his distant friend: “The times are as strange as can be said, and it seems to me more than enough to endure these troubles without writing them to others.” Yet while emphasizing the pontiff’s resolve “to preserve his authority without any human consideration, not even for his own life,” Morone also took care to praise the pope’s supposedly always “paternal” manner of speaking about King Philip - which seems unlikely - and his firmness in resisting lay interference in inquisitorial matters, especially in Sicily, Naples, and Morone’s own Milan, all Habsburg dominions. 134

“I hold it certain that not much time will pass before something more displeasing is heard, […] and I fear the matter may advance so far as to become irremediable,” he continued in this tortuous and at times contradictory letter, in which praise of the pontiff mingles with denunciation of the reckless vehemence with which he was dragging both himself and the whole Church into the abyss, so that “it is dangerous to become too deeply involved.” By then the situation seemed compromised beyond repair. Pope Carafa’s “fiery nature,” his proceeding without “any human consideration,” and his immovable determination to defend and impose “his authority, even if everything should be ruined,” left very little room for any attempt at mediation. In vain Muzzarelli continued to reassure Rome of the Habsburg sovereigns’ desire for peace, at times protesting with courageous frankness against the evident bad faith of Roman policy. In vain Morone asked Pole to pray that God might “inspire these princes to recognize their duty and remain within their proper bounds.” “I see a great fire burning and live in continual torment, assailed by endless discomfort and distress,” he wrote on 18 July 1556. “And if Your Most Reverend Lordship’s reminder to entrust oneself to divine providence did not sometimes sustain me, I believe I could not live long.” 135 In vain Pole exhorted the pontiff to peace, insisting that the war would endanger the precarious fortunes of the Catholic restoration in England. 136

No one could now halt Pope Carafa on the ruinous road he had taken. On 9 August, as the arrival of French troops in Italy gave the word to arms, Morone could do nothing but unburden himself to Pole, revealing that he was “full of distress, perturbation, and mistrust.” His desire to “be a Carthusian or a Camaldolese, or to be in England” 137 expressed his desolate awareness of human and political isolation, his wish to escape the oppressive climate that had formed in the Vatican palaces and flee the threatening clouds

gathering above his head. In the past, as has repeatedly been emphasized, his double loyalty to the papacy and the Empire had already led him through very difficult moments. He had confronted them with great skill and dignity, never abandoning his political commitment and indeed sustaining its irenic prospects. But now the stormy waters he had navigated so masterfully were being convulsed by the charge of heresy, which delegitimized his every action and lumped everything together without any longer distinguishing politics from religion. In reality, already in the summer of 1556, with the opening of military operations, the pope's obstinate policy ended in defeat, as Spanish troops invaded the territories of the Church. 138 The armistice signed in November between the duke of Alba and Carlo Carafa made plain the impossibility of sustaining military confrontation with the imperial army. Yet political humiliation was hardly the best weapon for calming a pontiff "resolved to die rather than suffer anything that appears unworthy of the position he holds," as Morone had already foreseen in early August, 139 urging Pole to use all his authority to induce Philip II to moderation.

Very little, indeed, could be expected from Paul IV, who was determined rather to suffer "martyrdom than allow himself to be brought to peace [against] his honor, understood in the manner His Holiness understands it." That meant, Morone wrote to his friend on 28 November, proceeding from the conviction "that nothing good can ever be done amid so many needs and disturbances of Christendom […] unless the honor of the vicar of Christ and of this holy see stands above the heads of all Christians, and especially the great princes." Only acceptance of such conditions would make peace possible, because even if "His Holiness, abandoned by the whole world, were reduced to the utmost extremity, he would nevertheless remain unconquerable," the Milanese cardinal concluded. A month later, in December 1556, he returned to the subject to stress the pope's absolute intransigence "in spiritual matters," in defense of his authority and prerogatives, his inflexible certainty of his own good reasons, and his judging the rights and wrongs of others solely according to his own "judgment." Any conciliatory gesture could therefore come only from Brussels, certainly not from Rome. 140 But the intervention of French troops in the spring of 1557 reignited the conflict, even inducing Paul IV, as noted above, to open a grotesque trial against the Habsburg sovereigns, depriving them of their kingdoms and accusing them of complicity with rebels against the Church. 141

5. Reform of the Church as a Struggle against Heresy

The inheritance left by the pontiff at his death was therefore difficult and fraught with problems. To humiliating political and military defeat, popular hatred, and the resentment of the "principal Roman barons," subjected to every abuse, 142 were added England's return to the Protestant faith after Queen Mary's death, the failure to convoke the council, the imprisonment and humiliation inflicted upon illustrious cardinals, the ruined treasury, and the discredit caused by the countless abuses and crimes of his nephews. Their conduct undermined the reputation for inflexible moral rigor and absolute dedication to reform with which Pope Carafa had ascended the throne. 143 Finally forced by the evidence to open his eyes and expel them from court, though only in January 1559, Paul IV was so irritated and, above all, so wounded in his dignity that he appeared "so astonished and confused in everything he does and says that he seems almost out of his senses," as the French ambassador wrote on 22 March. 144 Above all there was the poverty of the renewal promoted by a pontiff who for decades had made reform his banner. Upon receiving news of his election, Seripando had hoped that God would finally grant him the power to carry out the reform of which Paul III had always spoken without ever doing anything and of which Julius III had not even spoken, while in his very brief reign Marcellus II had tried to promote it by deeds rather than words. Now Paul IV's moment had come, Seripando wrote, hoping that he would speak of reform and put it into effect - or rather, put into effect what he spoke of - and that, just as in the past he had been great in words, he would now be great in deeds. Four years later, however, commenting bitterly on his death, Seripando observed that his pontificate had explained the words of Jesus Christ: "There is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and nothing hidden that shall not be known" (Matthew 10:26). 145 Once on the throne, Paul IV seemed in fact to turn his energies elsewhere, toward anti-Habsburg war and the repression of heresy, which he viewed as two sides of the same coin, though he did not spare exhortations, invectives, and announcements of imminent measures.

For only a few months did Pope Carafa seem to maintain the formal commitment made in a consistorial allocution at the beginning of 1556, when he delivered a “copious and vehement” address promising to carry out reform “in effect, just as past pontiffs for sixty years have proposed it in words.” He would address the court, “the Chancery, the Penitentiary, the Camerlengaria, the life of the cardinals and the perpetuity of benefices, with reversions, accessions, and other devices,” and finally “touch the princes without any respect.” 146 Many believed him and were later disappointed. When informing Beccadelli of the establishment of a new commission *super emendanda et reformanda Ecclesia*, for example, Gualteruzzi wrote on 1 February 1556 that the pope appeared “most ardent in wishing to carry out this holy reform.” 147 Morone too, striving to pour water upon the flames of the increasingly heated conflict between the pope and the Catholic king, tried on 4 January 1556 to assure Pole that “His Holiness has the best intention of attending to reform.” 148 On 31 March he rejoiced with his distant friend that “the datary’s shop is completely closed with regard to compositions, […] no more doves are sold in the temple of God, and His Holiness observes the words ‘freely you have received, freely give.’” 149 Finally, on 9 May he wrote to Filippo Gheri that “so much has been done in matters of reform, to tell you in a word, that the Datary no longer takes even one carlino for any composition and simony has been entirely excluded,” convinced that the pontiff “will make many other provisions if God grants him life.” 150

A few days earlier, during a conversation with Navagero, Paul IV had not merely reiterated in fiery language his will to end the simoniacal practices that had lain “upon his heart” for many years, including the sale “at the banks” for ready money of miters and red hats. He also proclaimed his certainty that he had been invested with a providential role: “We know what Our Lord wants from us; we must act, we must purge this evil from the head. […] Now we shall do it, even if we must leave our life in the undertaking.” He attributed the survival of the Apostolic See to a miracle, despite the fact that his predecessors had “done everything, one may say, to ruin it.” 151 He returned repeatedly to the subject. In April of that year, for example, after a dinner with several bishops, “he reproved them for not going to their bishoprics, since they left the bride a widow,” and warned them not to waste time “in visits, banquets, and perhaps games, but to study so as to know how to govern their little sheep.” Shortly thereafter he attacked cardinals who were “sellers of liberty” and received pensions from foreign princes, and then expelled from Rome Ippolito d’Este, his rival in the conclave, branding him “Simon Magus.” In June a rumor spread that “His Holiness wishes to restrain the life of the prelates” and had prepared a list “of many who keep concubines in their houses.” 152

Concrete deeds, however, did not follow the words. The commissions specially established and the decrees issued by the pontiff produced scant results, 153 despite his promise to “begin with himself” and attack the cancer of abuses starting “with his own skin, flaying and reforming it, so that he might then freely reform others, not only prelates but empires, kingdoms, and lords.” 154 The men he summoned to the Sacred College were often of mediocre profile: “servants of his of the lowest condition,” at times “wholly ignorant,” or else “Theatines and friars,” 155 especially Dominicans distinguished by inquisitorial militancy. Conversely, he did not conceal his contempt for many cardinals appointed by his predecessors, whom shortly after his election he even contemplated “removing all at once.” 156 The Sacred College changed profoundly during Pope Carafa’s years. He called into it first of all his old Theatine companions, such as Scotti and Consiglieri, friars such as Ghislieri, Petow, and Dolera, and canonists such as Rebiba, Reumano, and Rosario. On the eve of the cardinalatial creation of 15 March 1557, 157 a Roman newsletter reported that according to current rumors those chosen would “for the most part […] be Theatines of little consideration.” 158 Regardless of their human and intellectual stature, in some cases genuinely modest, these choices and comments effectively attest that the rupture with humanist culture had now been consummated. From the 1550s onward, the granting of the red hat to a great man of letters such as Pietro Bembo, or to figures such as Contarini, Fregoso, Pole, Sadoleto, and Cortese, was scarcely imaginable.

Beyond the scandalous conduct of his nephews, what chiefly caused reform to be forgotten were the urgencies of a war that for a long time made the sound of drums echo in the papal palaces more loudly than that of bells. 159 Already on 8 July 1556, from distant Ragusa, Beccadelli expressed the fear that the approaching “troubles” were the work of the devil, “to delay the holy intentions His Holiness has had for

many years to reform the Church." 160 Muzio expressed a similar view six months later in a courageous letter to Paul IV, warning him against the snares of the "enemy of the human race to impede holy reform," "confuse the sacred with the profane," and substitute temporal wars for spiritual ones. Muzzarelli, meanwhile, never tired of attributing to the devil the pope's "mistrust" of the Habsburg sovereigns, designed to distract him from "restoring morals and religion in the Church." 161 The grounding of the great designs with which Pope Carafa had ascended the throne was also caused by his increasingly debilitating old age, his authoritarian, intolerant, and centralizing temperament, and above all his obsession with the heretical demon. This led him to devote almost all his energy to the Holy Office, subordinating every demand for renewal to it. Until the very end he never ceased personally directing that tribunal with such severity as to make "everyone keep his wits about him with no little fear and dread." 162

This was the primary duty with which Paul IV felt invested, and he pursued it to the end. He expanded the Holy Office's tasks until blasphemers, simoniacs, apostate religious, rapists, and sodomites were also subjected to it; removed causes of faith from episcopal jurisdiction; forbade confessors to grant absolution *in foro conscientiae* for any deviation from right doctrine; and promoted the ecclesiastical careers of inquisitors. 163 It was he who at the end of 1558 published the first and draconian Index of Prohibited Books, which in Germany the Jesuit Peter Canisius called a *petram scandali*, a stumbling block, 164 and who in 1555 issued extremely severe discriminatory edicts against the Jews. 165 He declared that he refrained from expelling them from the city only "so that they might bear witness to the Christian faith and to their own ruin and dispersion." 166 His conception of reforming the Church, or at least of constructing its premises, thus consisted first and foremost in an unrelenting struggle against heresies, whether the theological heresy of the reformers or the simoniacal heresy of the corrupt clergy. 167 Despite his conviction that he had received from God the mandate "to pursue without any respect the honor of His divine Majesty and the good of this holy see," even if poverty forced him to go "begging with a bowl," 168 the centrality of the battle against the enemies of the faith ultimately relegated to the background the work of renewal that many, with hope or fear, had expected from his election.

And yet, despite the military defeats, political failures, inquisitorial fanaticism, overbearing authoritarianism, and the violence and plunder of his nephews, in the judgment of Alvise Mocenigo and "many others" Paul IV was "a most worthy and rare pontiff." The reasons he offered for this judgment help explain the meaning of the turning point of those years which, though dominated by a personality incapable of controlling his irrepressible ideological impulses, governing with any wisdom, or restraining his megalomania, witnessed

the emergence of a different conception of the papacy and the Church, founded on the primacy of religion and orthodoxy, on the moral conduct that was expected to follow from them, and on a new awareness of ecclesiastical dignity. “His Holiness was so pure and blameless in his habits and his life that even his enemies never dared impute to him the slightest vice,” the Venetian ambassador would report in 1560, observing that “by everyone’s account, compared with the times of other pontiffs, Rome could be regarded as a respectable monastery of religious.” This did not, of course, mean that the teeming papal curia had suddenly converted to Theatine devotional solemnity. It meant, rather, that a new hierarchy of values, a new decorum, or at least a new sense of shame, was asserting itself, entering customary behavior, and beginning to open the way to positions of responsibility and episcopal appointments. “Even when people sinned, they did so as secretly and privately as possible, whereas in former times everything proceeded licentiously, even among bishops and cardinals, without the slightest restraint.” Mocenigo added that “in temporal affairs [...] His Holiness [...] wished to be revered by kings and emperors, often showing in conversation that he held each of them in little esteem and saying that the pope, as Christ’s vicar, was lord over all temporal princes.” Yet this was not merely a revival of the old theological and juridical claims of papal theocracy. It reflected a new religious identity that grounded that primacy in the defense of the faith and in the proud assertion of the apostolic mission. For this reason too, “in the divine offices [...] and in ceremonies this pontiff conducted himself with such gravity and devotion that he truly seemed a most worthy vicar of Jesus Christ, and in all matters of religion he took such care and used such diligence that nothing greater could have been desired.” [169] At the time of his election, someone had rejoiced at the choice of “a great and holy pope.” [170]

It has repeatedly been emphasized that, in Carafa’s eyes, Pole and Morone were one and the same, bound together by a complicity made all the graver by the habit they wore, the imperial favor they enjoyed, and the universal prestige that surrounded them. He would say so himself in October 1557, during a tirade against the Venetian ambassador, who was pressing for Alvise Priuli to be appointed bishop of Brescia. Bluntly declaring that “he is a heretic,” he silenced his interlocutor’s objections with fiery words: [171]

> We are not speaking to you of anything we do not know for certain. We tell you that it is so, that many in the College know it, that we have witnesses above every exception, and that we can touch it with our own hands. He belongs to that accursed school and to that apostate household of the cardinal of England. [...] We mean to proceed and to strike. Cardinal Pole was the master, and Cardinal Morone, whom we have in the Castle, is the disciple, although the disciple has become worse than the master. Priuli stands on the same level as these men and as Marcantonio Flaminio, who, had he not died, would have had to be burned. We had his brother Cesare Flaminio, Priuli’s companion, publicly burned at the Minerva. And their associate was Galeazzo Caracciolo, son of the marquis of Vico and our own kinsman, [...] who left his father, his wife, nine children, and an income of about six thousand ducats and went off to Geneva to live with those wretches and lose both soul and body. Magnificent ambassador, let there be no more talk of this matter, for if our own father were a heretic, we ourselves would carry the bundles of wood to burn him! [...] His Sublimity would therefore do well not to pursue such a matter any further, for this is a jurisdiction that belongs to us; and for the honor of God we are ready to suffer every torment and, when we can do no more, to cast ourselves upon the ground and let ourselves be suffocated. But so long as we can walk, though weak and lame, we shall run forward.

A few days after his accession, as noted above, Paul IV had ordered the formal opening of proceedings against Morone and Pole. Carnesecchi, himself summoned to Rome for a new trial, wrote to Giulia Gonzaga that the pontiff seemed to be devoting himself body and soul to filling “the prisons with cardinals and bishops on account of the Inquisition” [172] and hurling his thunderbolts against the “accursed school,” the “apostate household of the cardinal of England,” and its “disciple,” Giovanni Morone. Pope Carafa’s “zeal and diligence” in matters of heresy were branded by many as “hardness, cruelty, and austerity,” [173] and the writers of pasquinades did not fail to target the Dominican friars “who counted it nothing | to make this man and that deny Christ | and turn human flesh into a wicked slaughterhouse,” along with their threatening admonitions: “Children, less judgment | and more faith, commands the Holy Office. | And argue little, | for against reason there stands the fire. | Keep your tongue in its place, | for Paul the Fourth greatly enjoys a roast.” [174]

The Milanese cardinal was confined in Castel Sant'Angelo on 31 May 1557. The next day, before the astonished cardinals assembled in consistory, Paul IV denied that the arrest had been prompted by political considerations, as was rumored because of the ongoing anti-Habsburg war. He claimed "to have proceedings of great importance against the cardinal dating back to the time of Paul III, and to know that Paul III had already reproved him paternally, but that he and another had never corrected themselves; indeed, to the peril of this most holy see, both had nearly attained this most holy dignity." [175] No one missed the reference to Pole. Even before Morone's arrest, on 9 April 1557, Pole had been recalled from his English legation 176 on the pretext of the war then under way, a pretext that barely concealed the pope's desire to bring him to Rome and imprison him too in Castel Sant'Angelo. The measure obviously struck at vital interests of Philip and Mary of England, who firmly resisted and kept with them the cardinal upon whom rested all hopes of returning the English Church to the Catholic faith - hopes that Paul IV did not hesitate to sacrifice to his repressive fanaticism and anti-Habsburg hatred. He himself bluntly explained the reasons for this sensational decision to Navagero: "In past conclaves we have seen the danger that was run. While we are alive, we mean to provide that the devil may never place one of his own in this see, for that would induce everyone to follow their wicked way of life. A heretic cannot be pope." [177] Pole would die in London in November 1558, almost at the same time as the queen, whose childlessness handed the throne over to the Protestant succession of the great Elizabeth. [178]

In 1558 the pontiff expressed a wish to prosecute another pro-imperial and "Lutheran" cardinal, Pietro Bertano, as well as the former ambassador to Rome and viceroy of Sicily, Juan Manrique de Lara. Politics and religion were thus intertwined indissolubly, as always, although in the final analysis it was the latter that dictated its laws to the former, bending politics into an instrument of an ecclesiology centered entirely on the claim to the universal primacy of the Roman Church and papal supremacy. [179] Once again, therefore, the Spanish sovereigns found themselves allied with those spirituali against whom the Inquisition never missed an opportunity to launch its shafts, and even entangled in the same accusations of heresy. This was so even though, from his retreat at Yuste, Charles V never ceased exhorting his successor to repress with the utmost severity the heterodox groups then discovered in Valladolid and Seville and to support the Inquisition in every way in its battle against heresy and apostasy. [180] Paul IV's hatred of the Catholic monarchs, the grotesque trials mounted against them, and the war were thus fused with the accusations of heresy against Pole and Morone, as different aspects of a ferocious struggle - ultimately a victorious one - against the whole of the recent past, against its political reality and culture, and against what no one now feared to denounce as its weaknesses, its vices, and at times its culpable complicities.

With Pole far away and difficult to prosecute, Morone was at once the most illustrious and the most defenseless representative of the hated spirituali. Hence the importance of a trial that, from the pontiff's perspective, was charged with bringing fully to light the web of collusion by which his adversaries had succeeded in concealing their errors, and with purifying the highest ranks of the Church of the heresies they had insinuated there, thus putting an end to the uncertainty - not to say the blindness - of his predecessors. In this perspective, definitive proof of the doctrinal deviations of Morone and his friends, followed by an exemplary condemnation, would legitimize and seal once and for all the policies Carafa had pursued with tenacious energy for twenty years. Defeated politically after the conclaves of 1549 and 1555, his adversaries could and must now be condemned theologically as well.

Only in this way could the ruthless harshness of the means by which he had finally triumphed and installed himself upon the throne of Peter be justified as a necessary religious commitment, under whose banner his battle in defense of the faith and the Church had been fought and won, if need be even in defiance of papal authority. And only in this way could the defeat of Pole and Morone be transformed into an unappealable judgment against their heresies, their deplorable irenicism, and even their pro-Habsburg leanings, thereby offering future centuries proof of the providential role of the Holy Office and establishing once and for all its primacy in defining theological norms, defending Catholic orthodoxy, and guiding the Church.

Chapter Sixteen

“The Pope Is Bent on Filling the Prisons with Cardinals and Bishops”: The Trial

1. The Arrest and the First Interrogations

By the end of 1553, after Bartoli’s recantation, Morone’s inquisitorial dossier contained only the memorials of Scotti and Nerli and some trace of Davidico’s confession. As could easily have been predicted, no one had had the courage to submit a formal denunciation that would allow proceedings to begin. As Eliseo Masini would explain with bureaucratic clarity in the *Sacro arsenale* at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the practice of the Holy Office provided for “two ways of forming trials,” namely “by denunciation” or “by inquisition”: [1] the former when someone - “to relieve his own conscience, out of zeal for the holy faith, to avoid falling under excommunication, or because his confessor has imposed it upon him” - presented the Holy Office with a *notitia criminis*; the latter when the tribunal itself took the initiative on the basis of suspicions, indications, and evidence of the accused’s public reputation for heresy, sufficient to require it to act even in the absence of a denunciation. Since the legitimacy of the trial depended upon that public reputation, it had to be documented in the record with specific evidence.

Inherited from Roman law, the distinction between accusatory and inquisitorial procedure thus allowed the Holy Office to become an active party in the struggle against the enemies of the faith. That was what happened in Morone’s case. Neither his exalted rank, his European prestige, nor his political role could protect him from a trial “by way of inquisition” once the fires and festivities of the new pope’s coronation had died down. Hence the importance of those few and meager documents, whose task was to attest the public reputation that Morone had “done or said something against the holy faith” - as Masini again writes - and that this reputation had come “to the ears of the inquisitor, especially through serious, honorable persons zealous for the faith” [2] (which, truth be told, hardly described Scotti and Davidico). As the Florentine Dominican Vincenzo Castrucci, inquisitor of Perugia from 1585, explains in his *Fundamentum processus conficiendi in causa fidei*, in the absence of a denunciation such public reputation had to be proved through at least two witnesses immune from any possible challenge. [3] Although irrelevant to the formulation of the specific charges, therefore, those memorials acquired - or constructed - in 1551-53 in defiance of Julius III’s precise orders 4 constituted the indispensable formal premise that allowed, indeed obliged, Paul IV to open proceedings “by virtue of his office.” Pope Carafa did so little more than a month after his election, confirming his impatience to set in motion a long-prepared design. He had already given a kind of warning when, on 28 May, he signed the capitulations with the College of Cardinals: while guaranteeing its many privileges, he pledged not to prosecute any of its members without the consent of two-thirds, except in cases of heresy, schism, or lèse-majesté. [5]

Less than a month later, on 24 June, he issued the brief that granted the Dominican Tommaso Scotti of Vigevano the title of commissioner of the Roman Inquisition and, conferring the broadest powers upon him, charged him with collecting depositions in Rome and elsewhere against anyone whatsoever, of every condition, status, rank, order, and dignity, even bishops, archbishops, primates, and patriarchs. Given the aims of this mission, the order to observe the utmost secrecy in order to avoid the scandal that might arise was naturally not merely a routine recommendation but a precise duty of the inquisitor, who for this occasion was also exempted from the obligation to record depositions in the presence of witnesses. [6] All the more so because the investigations now begun with full procedural formality aimed to gather evidence not only against Morone but against all the disciples of the “school” of the cardinal of England. Both Pole’s recall from the legation on 9 April and the arrest of the Milanese cardinal on 31 May 1557 rested upon the inquisitorial activity initiated by that brief, which Friar Tommaso Scotti obeyed by leaving Rome without delay.

By 7 July 1555 he was already in San Gimignano, where he opened the preliminary phase of the trial by recording the testimony of Friar Bernardo Bartoli, who was immediately ready - in the changed political climate - to renew his old accusations and repudiate his recantation of 1552. [7] The interrogations continued at a brisk pace through the summer, following a list of witnesses that was partly ready in advance but was also continually updated in light of new indications they supplied. Five more people were heard in July and six between August and September, along an itinerary that ran through Florence (Reginaldo Nerli), Borgo San Lorenzo (Matteo Lachi and his fellow friar Girolamo of Florence), Bologna (Giovan Battista Scotti), Modena (the Dominicans Michele della Coltre, Cherubino Todeschi, and Alberto Foscheri, together with the laymen Giovanni Castelvetro and Alessandro Tassoni), and then Bologna once again (Domenico Adelasio, former inquisitor of Modena and later of Bergamo), while another deposition was meanwhile taken in Rome (Alfonso Salmerón). Nine of the first twelve witnesses were Dominican friars.

Thus unfolded the informative phase of the trial, during which deponents were to be "examined in secret, solely for the information of the Holy Office, and not yet solemnly," in order to gather "sufficient indication to cite the accused to appear, or to arrest and arraign him." [8] After its rapid beginning, however, the investigation seemed to slow and then stall after Tommaso Scotti returned to Rome in September with the records he had gathered. These were incorporated into the "large bundle or volume" containing various "writings, namely summary, opinions, examinations, and decrees against Cardinal Morone and other persons suspected of heresy," dated 1555, which was still listed among the papers of the Holy Office transferred by Napoleon to Paris in 1810. [9] Only one incriminating deposition was acquired in 1556, that of Bartolomeo della Pergola, then himself on trial; [10] and only one more, that of the Dominican Angelo Cattani of Diacceto, preceded the cardinal's arrest in April 1557. [11] To these depositions were added the few documents already in the inquisitors' hands: [12] extracts from the trials of Apollonio Merenda and Vittore Soranzo, the *Epistola de iustificatione* written by Contarini after the failure at Regensburg, several letters delivered to the Holy Office by Giovan Battista Scotti, the letter sent on 15 February 1551 by the Lateran canon regular Celso Martinengo to Ippolito Chizzola, a handful of Modenese documents perhaps received in Rome only later, [13] and little else. Something nevertheless leaked beyond the tribunal, as suggested by a letter Morone sent on 6 June 1556 to Beccadelli, then archbishop of Ragusa. He seemed to be referring not only to the war under way when he assured him that "the change of countries will seem to you no great hardship, although they are so different from these, which are now so much more troubled that one may congratulate friends who are absent from them and at such a distance that they can scarcely even hear news of them." [14] A threatening warning must have seemed the fact that a few months earlier, while on his way to Mass at the church of Santo Spirito in Sassia, Morone had been informed by a guard that he was "forbidden to leave Rome." "A matter that gives much cause for thought," commented a newsletter of 11 September 1555: "It is believed that they mean to reopen the heresy case brought against him under Pope Paul III, which will serve the interests of his rivals." [15] Perhaps for this reason too he refrained from answering the letter in which, at the beginning of the year, Beccadelli - evidently unaware of the inquisitorial proceedings previously faced by Don Ippolito Chizzola - had asked his support in having Chizzola sent to Ragusa to preach during the coming Lent. [16] The Lateran canon regular had indeed returned to the Catholic fold, so much so that Vergerio denounced him as an apostate, [17] but the cardinal's embarrassment is understandable.

The war against the Habsburgs, with weapons clashing at the very gates of Rome, and the temperament of the pontiff, "slow in all dispatches and actions and [...] irresolute," [18] undoubtedly helped bog down the preliminary inquiry between the autumn of 1555 and the spring of 1557. No less important, however, was the need to postpone Morone's arrest until the tribunal had succeeded in confining in Roman prisons several figures long under suspicion, from whom the Holy Office had good reason to expect important revelations. The decree of 18 June 1556, which stripped of every ecclesiastical benefice anyone suspected of heresy, referred also to them and especially to Pietro Carnesecchi. [19] Seen in this light, the long interruption of the proceedings must be related to the tenacious efforts of the inquisitorial authorities to obtain from the Este duke the arrest and extradition of four citizens of Modena, among the best-known representatives of religious dissent in what had for many years been Morone's diocese. Their names had repeatedly been mentioned by the witnesses examined thus far: Ludovico Castelvetro, Antonio Gadaldino, Bonifacio Valentini, and Filippo

Valentini. [20] The hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that Friar Tommaso Scotti refrained from interrogating these men in Modena in the summer of 1555, while immediately after his return to Rome, on 1 October, the brief summoning them before the Holy Office was issued. [21]

Despite the opposition of Ercole II d'Este and the chorus of protests in solidarity raised by the Modenese authorities, the brief was published at the beginning of July 1556, and in October the elderly bookseller Antonio Gadaldino was arrested. The others, protected by stronger social and political ties, managed to hide or flee. After a long contest between Rome and Ferrara, the matter was only partly resolved in the spring of 1557, when the duke finally had to give way and, on 30 April, authorized Gadaldino's delivery to Bologna. In those same days Bonifacio Valentini too was induced to appear in Bologna, only to be taken immediately to Rome and subjected to a trial that, like the bookseller's, would end with abjuration in March 1558. Ludovico Castelvetro and Filippo Valentini instead succeeded in taking refuge in the Grisons. [22] It was then, with Morone's arrest now imminent, that a first extract of the trial testimony was prepared to inform the pontiff of the evidence acquired up to that point. [23]

On 22 May 1557 another Modenese, Don Domenico Morando, for more than twenty years one of the Milanese cardinal's most faithful collaborators and then his household steward, was arrested "by a multitude of constables" and confined in the Ripetta prison, [24] "without the bargello even being willing to hear a word from the cardinal, however insistently His Most Reverend Lordship appealed to him." That same day Bernardo Navagero reported the news to the Venetian government: "This detention is judged important and likely to touch the cardinal, who for various reasons is not in great favor with His Holiness or his household." [25] The circle was now closing around Morone, as Carnesecchi did not fail to perceive when, on 5 June, informing Giulia Gonzaga from Venice of Morando's arrest, he called it "almost an omen." [26] For his part, the Milanese cardinal understood perfectly well what was about to happen. He hurried to Carlo Carafa to reject the accusations that he was a fanatical imperialist, an enemy of the Carafa family, and a supporter of heterodox doctrines, only to receive the icy reply "that even if His Most Reverend Lordship were imperial, he did not think that mattered greatly, since everyone was free and could feel affection for whomever he pleased; as for hatred toward his house, he had never harbored any suspicion; and regarding religion, he knew nothing of it and therefore did not concern himself with it and never would." The Venetian ambassador judged the initiative unfortunate, "for an excuse offered out of time and without being requested is always suspicious." Equally unfortunate was Morone's decision to ask Pietro Bertano, himself Modenese and himself the object of suspicion, whether in his opinion "a certain book entitled *Beneficium Christi* [...] contained sound doctrine." The cardinal of Fano reportedly answered "that it had been a long time since he had seen the book and, if he saw it now, he could answer on firmer grounds; but as far as he could remember, where it spoke of works it seemed to him somewhat suspect." [27]

With the political crisis with the Habsburgs now at its height, Pole's English legation revoked, the preliminary inquiry completed, and the suspected Modenese delivered to Rome, the time had come to make public and channel into a formal trial the investigation Friar Tommaso Scotti had conducted for almost two years. Late on the morning of 31 May 1557, Morone was summoned by Carlo Carafa to discuss "an important matter." When he reached the cardinal-nephew's rooms, he first saw the doors close around him and then heard Carafa, without offering details, simply communicate the pope's order that he be confined in Castel Sant'Angelo, where he was immediately escorted. Another member of his household, Marcantonio Villamarina, who had previously been under suspicion by the Inquisition, was also arrested, and all the others were kept under lock and key. Officials of the Holy Office searched his study and seized documents, papers, and books, including various works by Erasmus, Melanchthon, Ochino, Battista da Crema, and Urbanus Rhegius; Johannes Carion's *Chronica*; Leonard Fuchs's *Apologia*; Vergerio's pamphlet against Della Casa's Index of 1549; Colonna's *Rime spirituali*; Cardinal Fregoso's *Pio et christianissimo trattato della oratione*; numerous editions of the Bible, including Erasmus's *Novum instrumentum*; and even Machiavelli's *Discourses*. [28] "The imprisonment of so great a cardinal, once named by the imperialists among the foremost candidates for pope, dear, so far as one can understand, to King Philip, but dearest of all to the queen of

England and a very close friend of Cardinal Pole, leaves everyone in suspense, especially in these times when there is such need to negotiate an agreement," Navagero commented. [29]

The next day, [1] June, the pontiff summoned the consistory and, without allowing any of the stunned cardinals to open his mouth, launched into a long invective intended to make clear once and for all that no misunderstanding could or should arise over the affair. What "the vulgar people were going about proclaiming" was false: the cardinal had not been arrested for political reasons, but "for a more important cause in which the honor of God was at stake." He declared "that he had very important proceedings against the cardinal dating from the time of Paul III and knew that Paul III had already reproved him paternally, but that he and another had never corrected themselves." This was all the more serious because "one and the other had nearly attained this most holy dignity." [30] The reference to the cardinal of England was perfectly clear and was immediately understood by those present. Paul IV alluded to him again in the vehement words he spoke during the audience granted the Venetian ambassador the following day: [31]

> We wish to account to you for the detention of Cardinal Morone, because perhaps many will believe it concerns an affair of state, which in fact it does not. Had that been the cause, it would have been necessary to act much earlier. The truth is that we had him detained for the Inquisition. We held our congregations, the proceedings were read, many accomplices have been in our hands, so that we could not do otherwise, although it grieves us profoundly that it should be known that in the College of Cardinals, which is the supreme magistracy in the religion of Christ, there are some stained with heresy. [...] It may be that one day a council will be held [...] at which we would not wish it to be objected to us: "You who now preach and wish to reform others, did you not have beside you in the College of Cardinals persons who thought as we do? Why did you not provide against them?" Magnificent ambassador, we do not mean to await such reproaches!

The simultaneous arrest of the bishops of Limassol, the Venetian Andrea Centani, and of Cava dei Tirreni, Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice - long suspected because of the positions he had taken on justification at Trent and confined on the same day as Morone 32 - together with the summons to Rome of Carnesecchi and Soranzo decreed by the Holy Office on 6 May, made the design inspiring the pontiff's inquisitorial policy plain to everyone. "Now that the temporal war is over, it seems a spiritual one is beginning, so that the world may not remain idle and there may always be occasion to exercise both spirit and flesh," Carnesecchi wrote to Donna Giulia. He informed her that Morone "had made it known to all his friends and servants that, if they wished to please him, they should not weary themselves trying to secure his release either from His Holiness or from any other prince, for he claimed that his innocence ought to be enough for him; and trusting in it, he entered prison, so it is said, with a face so joyful and a spirit so calm and tranquil that it was as though he were going to a wedding." [33]

Everywhere the news of that sensational arrest provoked bewilderment, apprehension, dismay, indignation, and "infinite amazement." [34] Many of the witnesses later called to testify in the defensive proceedings would recall their disbelief when they learned what had happened. "If His Most Reverend Lordship was judged and convicted of heresy, I would never again believe that any person was Catholic," commented Giovan Battista Grossi, bishop of Reggio Emilia. [35] At Alessandro Farnese's table, a Roman nobleman did not hesitate to say that "if it is true that Cardinal Morone is held in the Castle as a heretic, I wish to say, and do say, that the rest of the cardinals are worse than the great infernal devil." [36] "It seemed the strangest news ever heard, and could not be believed," to the point that Giovanni Boccadiferro publicly declared that "if Cardinal Morone is a Lutheran [...] all the rest of Christians will be scattered." [37] Giulio Galletti, bishop of Alessano, would say that he had wished "for the service of Christendom that all were as Monsignor Most Reverend Morone is." [38] A Modenese merchant then in Germany would report that "the king of Poland and the king of the Romans and all those princes were scandalized to hear that so good a man was being persecuted." [39] Finally, Girolamo Federici would confess that he had found himself in difficulty because wherever he went at the time - Milan, Padua, Genoa - "everyone said that this matter of Cardinal Morone was a persecution," making it hard for him to defend the Holy Office, of which he was an officer. In his heart, however, he knew that "the pope was not proceeding in the proper manner, even if Cardinal Morone had had some fault in this matter, for he should never have imprisoned him but admonished him

charitably, edifying rather than scandalizing." He added that, had he been able to speak freely, he would have said that "Paul IV bore ill will and malice against the said Cardinal Morone." [40]

On 2 June the rumor spread "that there is nothing against Morone, but they hope to find something either through the examinations or elsewhere." [41] On the tenth, Francisco Vargas, then in Venice, wrote to Ferdinand of Habsburg that Morone's arrest had scandalized many, who believed it arose from malice and from the schemes of certain men to destroy a person of such quality, widely expected to become pope at the next vacancy. He will not be the only one struck, Vargas concluded, with an obvious allusion to the cardinal of England. [42] The report sent to London on 5 June by the English ambassador Edward Carne was similar in tone, assuring his recipients that Morone was as Catholic and virtuous as very few others and that the accusations against him arose only from the pontiff's severity and his fear that Morone might be elected pope. [43] That same day Bongianni Gianfigliazzi reported to Florence that Cardinal Pacheco had not concealed from the pontiff the widespread view that the purpose of this "affront intended to stain Morone" was "not so much to deprive him of the papacy as, by this means, to strike Cardinal Pole as well, since it is known that they are great friends and one and the same, and thereby to ensure that a new pontiff should not be a person well disposed toward His Majesty." Paul IV replied curtly that one should not be surprised by such gossip from "evil tongues."

On that occasion Paul IV agreed with the Spanish cardinal's observation that "such an event was bound to cause great disturbance in Germany, where Morone is held in great veneration; and that always to hear that among the cardinals there are persons of this kind, infected in matters of faith, would be a very great scandal and could only produce bad effects, and that [...] it also reflected blame upon His Holiness." [44] This did not prevent him from continuing straight along his chosen path and, as noted, appointing as legate to England on 14 June 1558 the decrepit Franciscan William Petow, newly made a cardinal, while summoning Pole to Rome. "It is believed that, seeing Morone in the Castle, he will not come, so as not to have to keep him company," the Florentine resident wrote on 17 June, also noting that Paul IV had refused to recognize Alvise Priuli's right of succession to the diocese of Brescia. [45] "See what an antiphon this is for Cardinal Pole," Beccadelli commented in a letter to Filippo Gheri on 13 July, rejoicing from distant Ragusa to be "outside so many storms." [46] Terrified by the increasingly sensational news arriving from Rome each day, on the seventeenth Giulia Gonzaga reported to Don Ferrante the rumor "that the pope will gradually summon the other cardinals, that he will wish to close the Council of Trent and make his successor - I mean elect him now. I do not know whether you will believe such a thing, but many things are being seen." [47] On the nineteenth Navagero informed Venice that, applying an inquisitorial rule to the letter, the pontiff had forbidden Morone to celebrate or hear Mass, [48] just as at the beginning of September he denied him "permission to take the jubilee," [49] proclaimed on 28 August for peace among the Christian princes and in the Church. [50]

2. "I See Cardinal Morone's Affairs in the Worst Possible State for Him"

Although completely excluded from the direction of Roman policy and often regarded with poorly concealed distrust, the imperial cardinals attempted to react. Against the background of the ongoing war, the fear was not wholly unfounded that the pontiff would "put on trial anyone in Rome known to be imperial and call them Lutherans," as was written from Venice to Ferdinand of Habsburg. [51] Ercole Gonzaga immediately contacted Ippolito d'Este, Don Juan Manrique de Lara, and Alessandro Farnese, [52] who was then in Parma. After supporting Carafa's election and initially encouraging his pro-French policy, Farnese had now distanced himself in order to draw closer to the Habsburgs and, through the restoration of Piacenza, obtain definitive recognition of the duchy governed by his brother. [53] Gualteruzzi, moreover, had immediately taken refuge in Parma, "so well regarded and caressed by these Farnese lords," as was written from Bologna to Beccadelli on 21 August 1557, "that he would not wish even to be painted in Rome; and rightly so, for not even dogs would wish to be there, much less men." [54] Both Filippo Gheri, [55] who had likewise left Rome, and Anna Morone Stampa wrote to Cardinal Farnese for news and advice. She asked for his support and consulted him on the advisability of sending Gheri to the court in Brussels. [56] For her part, Margaret of

Austria, wife of Ottavio Farnese, sent her words of solidarity and comfort. [57] From Germany Cardinal Truchsess contacted Farnese to seek news and confide his "very great sorrow [...] over the many calamities and misfortunes of poor Italy," without hiding his indignation at the unheard-of accusations Pope Carafa had formulated against authoritative members of the Sacred College. [58] With even more explicit indignation, Pietro Antonio Di Capua, writing to Ferrante Gonzaga on 8 July, lashed out at the pontiff, who "when he cannot prevail through temporal war, helps himself with the spiritual, which is no less important." From this perspective Morone's case seemed emblematic: the pontiff was persecuting him because he was "a subject capable and fit for the papacy by reason of his rare virtues." Philip II had to react as soon as possible, because otherwise "all His Majesty's servants will become prey to their enemies," he concluded, eager to find "some good and honorable occasion" to leave Naples "for as long as this pontificate lasts, from which I can expect nothing but harm and ruin." [59] In August 1557 another pro-Habsburg cardinal, Pietro Bertano, had to watch with acute anxiety as one of his secretaries was arrested on behalf of the Inquisition. On the twenty-first of that month, writing to Queen Mary, the English ambassador emphasized the affair's obvious political motives and did not hesitate to denounce its intimidating character. He reported the widespread belief that it would shortly be the turn of the cardinal of Fano himself, who was also in the inquisitors' sights on suspicion of heresy, though the real reason was his fanatical pro-imperialism. As for Morone, according to rumors circulating in Rome, no charge could be proved against him, but no one dared speak in his defense. [60] The cardinal of Mantua remained in close contact precisely with Bertano, his former collaborator, and perhaps received from him the text of the *articuli* of accusation 61 by which, at the beginning of October 1557, the charges against the Milanese cardinal were formally set out and the decisive phase of the trial began.

Meanwhile, on 3 June, Paul IV assembled the cardinals of the Holy Office - whom he would later assure that the sentence would be submitted to the judgment of the entire congregation 62 - and entrusted Morone's trial to Cardinals Michele Ghislieri, Giovanni Reumano, Scipione Rebiba, and Virgilio Rosario. [63] All were theologians and canonists aligned with the intransigent position, carefully chosen because he knew he would find in them completely faithful executors of his instructions. The fact that all four had been raised to the purple by the reigning pontiff was regarded as an insult to the Sacred College, revealing Pope Carafa's low opinion of it and his even lower trust in it. In his eyes, however, the trial was too important to entrust to anyone other than his closest collaborators in directing the Holy Office. Foremost among them was Ghislieri, now Cardinal Alessandrino, after the Piedmontese city from which he came. In a unique case in history, on 14 December 1558 Paul IV granted him the title *summus et perpetuus inquisitor*, [64] giving him "the broadest power [...] over the Inquisition, [...] so that he alone might do what the whole Inquisition could do collectively." [65] "I see Cardinal Morone's affairs in the worst possible state for him," an informant of Ercole Gonzaga wrote from Ferrara on 6 June. [66] Their shared political orientation would make Gonzaga an alert and engaged observer of his Milanese colleague's case in the months that followed. On 9 June Morone's auditor, Girolamo Parisetto, was also held in prison for several days, while the arrival in Rome of the suspected Modenese drew the attention of the Roman news writers: "It is increasingly said that the affair of the Most Reverend Morone concerns heresy, since he was bishop of that Modena which is full of this error," reported a newsletter of 12 June, while noting the widespread astonishment that such a thing could happen to "such a lord, a cardinal, and one of the foremost." [67]

Formally established by a *motu proprio* of 11 June, [68] the commission charged with the trial went to Castel Sant'Angelo the very next day to confront Morone with the offenses that had emerged from the inquiry, [69] allowing him to produce a document in which he might offer whatever justifications and clarifications he considered appropriate. As Vincenzo Castrucci would explain, after an arrest the accused had to be presented with a list of the charges against him, though the names of persons and the dates and places of the alleged offenses were concealed. [70] He was required to account for them "spontaneously and truthfully," [71] either through declarations immediately entered into the record or in writing, by composing the so-called *confessio*. The Milanese cardinal did so. On 18 June he delivered to the tribunal a text setting out his own version of the facts regarding the charges communicated orally to him: "heretical books," "justification," "the *Beneficio di Christo*," "Friar Bernardo," "Salmerón," "works and merits," "alms given to suspect persons," "relics" and "the intercession of the saints," and "association with some who were later

discovered to be of evil mind in religion." [72] These were cautious pages in which he tried to clarify, explain, distinguish, and specify what was imputed to him, without knowing what the inquisitors actually knew or what evidence they possessed. He therefore ran the risk of giving the tribunal an opportunity to compare his assertions with those of the witnesses, measure his sincerity, understand his defensive strategies, and thereby acquire fresh evidence against him.

The opening page of the document, in which Morone summarized his meeting with the four colleagues charged with trying him, was steeped in the solemn formulas of curial piety. One may reasonably suppose that the encounter was more laden with tension and poorly concealed hostility than his words suggest, beginning with their expressions of sorrow for his "affliction," their communication of "His Holiness's paternal disposition," and their exhortation that he "tell everything spontaneously and truthfully." He had replied that he was ready "to say everything that might be to the honor and glory of His Divine Majesty and the salvation of [his] soul [...] and to the satisfaction of the holy and upright mind of His Holiness and Their Most Reverend Lordships," reminding them that he had already offered to do so at the conclusion of the conclave. He then declared that he was neither "a theologian nor a canonist, but rather an ignorant man," and professed his complete obedience to the Roman Church, to which he had always been and intended always to remain faithful, convinced that no one could be saved outside it, guided as it was by the "vicar of Christ on earth and successor of Saint Peter." He therefore acknowledged the reigning pontiff as such and had supported his election - something he would never have done, "knowing His Holiness's zeal," had he possessed "a corrupt mind in matters of religion." [73]

The cardinal under investigation was careful not to deny outright what was alleged against him, which might have sounded to his judges like obstinate lying. Instead he acknowledged certain errors, admitted that he had entertained doubts and in some cases acted imprudently, but denied any theological expertise, invoked motives and circumstances, diminished the significance of episodes and supposed friendships, declared that he had changed his mind on certain doctrinal questions, and said he was willing to listen to anyone who could help him better understand the Church's teaching. Above all, he tried to confine his hesitations to a distant period before the decrees of Trent, when the contours of Catholic truth were still uncertain and the resulting religious disorientation was widespread. In short, he sought to induce the inquisitors to set aside the principle *semel haereticus, semper haereticus*, which instead formed a foundation of their thought and action. [74]

A week later, on the twenty-fifth, the interrogations began, though they proceeded slowly amid rumors and conjectures of every kind. "It appears that [the pope] is proceeding against Pole as he is against Morone, and that there are such judgments of heresy against him, so abhorrent to the world and especially to His Holiness, who wishes by every means, if our Lord God grants him strength, to uproot it," Giulio Grandi wrote to Ferrara on 15 June. "The universal opinion is that [the pope intends] to destroy this English sect to which Morone belonged," Bongianni Gianfigliazzi echoed two days later. Someone better informed reported that "His Holiness having caused Cardinal Morone to be asked whether he wished grace or rigor, His Most Reverend Lordship replied that his conscience was so clean that he had no need of grace, but desired the full rigor of justice, so that this too might be known to everyone." [75] According to the English resident, nothing could be proved against him, and for that very reason the Holy Office would have been willing to restore his freedom if only he had agreed to abjure. He was in no way prepared to do so, however, since he refused to acknowledge himself guilty. Convinced of his innocence, he desired justice alone, the resident informed the English sovereigns on 2 July, while stressing that there was very little hope the pope would agree to release him. By the end of the month it was being written in Spain that many judged him to be in great danger, especially because he seemed entirely unwilling to bend.

> When the servants of the Most Illustrious Morone pressed for his dispatch, Navagero reported to Venice on 5 August, [76] His Most Reverend Lordship was informed that it would be well for him to prepare to ask grace of the pontiff, since a way would then be found to free him. The cardinal replied that grace presupposes guilt and that he would therefore not ask it; he wished his case to be judged according to justice, even if his life should depend upon it. And so he caused his people to be told that from then on they were to cease seeking his dispatch.

Meanwhile the trial languished, while from Rome “every day one hears worse,” Beccadelli lamented in distant Ragusa. [77] Morone was heard again by the inquisitors on 28 June, [6] July, and 10 and 24 September, [78] after a long summer pause during which only a few extracts from Antonio Gadaldino’s examinations were entered into the record, [79] while nothing that could be used as evidence against Morone emerged from the interrogations of Bonifacio Valentini.

The slowing of the trial during the summer probably also resulted from the course of the anti-Spanish war, which was certainly not turning in the pontiff’s favor. “Rome is in danger,” people wrote at the beginning of July. [80] The dramatic reports reaching Beccadelli from the papal city led him to observe that “all Christendom [...] seems to be in the greatest distress it has known for many years.” [81] At the end of the month Marcantonio Colonna defeated Paul IV’s troops beneath the walls of Paliano, and on 10 August, at Saint-Quentin, Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy led the imperial army to a historic victory over the French. The duke of Alba’s soldiers could now roam with impunity beneath the walls of Rome. Finally, on 14 September 1557, the truce of Cave suspended the conflict. Despite the petty maneuvers of Paul IV’s nephews to defend their own interests, which became entangled in the negotiations, it could barely conceal the catastrophe into which papal policy had fallen and the grave humiliation Pope Carafa now had to swallow. While the Tiber too intervened with a disastrous flood, on 19 September the duke of Alba entered Rome for the official ceremony of reconciliation, with devout professions of obedience that did not fail to trouble the elderly Charles V, who remained extremely sensitive to the dignity of the crown even in his final retreat at Yuste.

Alba’s visit was not intended only to offer the splendid spectacle of restored concord and to seal the end of the war. There is no doubt that Pole’s recall to Rome was also discussed during those conversations, and one of Pole’s envoys likewise arrived in an attempt to temper the pontiff’s blind rigor. It was in these very months, in the summer of 1557, that the cardinal of England wrote a courageous and bitter *Apologia* addressed to Paul IV. In it he asserted his constant commitment to the unity and authority of the Church and recalled the many sufferings - beginning with the slaughter of his relatives ordered by Henry VIII - that he had endured for more than twenty years precisely because he had always lived in obedience to the Roman Church. [82] The biblical injunction not to uncover a father’s nakedness (Gen. 9:21-25) would prevent him from sending to Rome those pages of great human and religious dignity, in which he associated his own case with that of his friend confined in Castel Sant’Angelo and raised a protest against the reigning pontiff. In his view Paul IV had acted against Morone in a manner without precedent. Pole linked Morone’s cause closely to that of the cardinal of England and wrote that he would never have wished the former to be separated from his own. [83] Meanwhile, news and rumors circulating in Rome about the Milanese cardinal’s trial grew increasingly pessimistic. Yet at the beginning of September Morone once again rejected the proposal that he obtain absolution merely by throwing himself “at the pope’s feet and asking his forgiveness” - “If I have erred, I wish to be punished, and if I have not erred, I wish to leave here without any stain,” he replied - nor did he accept the offer of having “his own house as a prison and even being able to walk about Trastevere.” [84]

Only in the autumn, with the end of the Spanish-papal war, could Philip II intervene directly with Paul IV on behalf of the Milanese cardinal. The duke of Alba raised the issue during the Roman conversations following the peace of Cave, in which he advocated Morone’s cause “warmly,” but without extracting from the pontiff anything more than consent to a meeting with the imprisoned cardinal and a promise to show the king the proceedings then under way against Morone and Pole, in order to convince him of the sound reasons that had led Paul IV to hurl the thunderbolts of the Inquisition against them. [85] The Spanish sovereign thus sought to address the problem on the political terrain, where mediation would have been possible and his recent military victory offered him good room for negotiation. Pope Carafa’s attitude was wholly opposed. He wished to confine the affair to the religious sphere, which allowed him to remove it from every intervention by Philip II. Hence, after the truce, while the pontiff vented his fury against the “apostate household” of the cardinal of England and against Pole’s friends and servants in a famous invective reported by Navagero, [86] the trial was decisively accelerated by delivering the *articuli* of accusation to Morone, a step indicating that the evidence gathered thus far had been deemed sufficient to open the formal phase. [87]

3. The Roman Trial of Lorenzo Davidico

Meanwhile, on 9 June 1555, shortly before the brief entrusting Friar Tommaso Scotti with the inquiry into Pole and Morone, Don Lorenzo Davidico - who had returned to Rome a few weeks earlier 88 - was summoned to the Roman palace of the Inquisition and asked whether he knew any layman or ecclesiastic suspected of heresy. [89] The immediate clarification that the information expected from him concerned a great prelate reveals the judges' intention to induce him to return to what he had reported two years earlier to the cardinal of Carpi and thereby give his deposition the force of a true denunciation in preparation for opening Morone's trial.

Perhaps afraid of falling into a trap, Don Lorenzo immediately appeared uncomfortable. He struggled to understand what was wanted from him, temporized with lies great and small, uncertainties, contradictions, and lapses of memory, and above all, after obtaining time to reflect with a promise to return, made the unforgivable mistake of fleeing Rome, thereby confirming every suspicion of the inquisitors. A few months later, confined in the Ripetta prisons, he would try to justify this rash act. He admitted that he had erred out of "fear of falling into some trouble" and asked forgiveness, using as a pretext the doctors' exhortations that he go urgently "to the baths" and above all trying to shelter behind the authority of Cardinal Otto Truchsess. Asked for advice in that difficult moment, Truchsess had allegedly suggested that he devote himself to preaching and not "perform this office of accusing anyone." [90] Yet that was precisely what Rodolfo Pio da Carpi had again asked of him the following day, this time inviting him to submit a written deposition. [91] Hence his decision to take flight. Once he had escaped Rome, however, Don Lorenzo also had the unfortunate idea of writing bluntly to Carpi that he "did not wish to be a spy for the Inquisition," [92] forgetful of the accusations he had already carried to him two years earlier. The gesture was all the more ill judged because his letter reached Rome in the same days that the machinery of Morone's trial was set in motion.

At the beginning of July 1555 Friar Tommaso Scotti was in Florence, where he recorded the testimony of Matteo Lachi, who was ready to report the suspicions concerning the Milanese cardinal that he had heard from Davidico's own lips. [93] Shortly afterward Davidico reached Venice and delivered to a printer yet another pamphlet, the *Laberintho di pazzi*, published at the beginning of the following year, in which he swore that "even to the shedding of blood" he wished to be "a declared combatant against the heretics, sword in hand." [94] At the same time, however, he did not refrain from stigmatizing those friars who, taking advantage of being "in some favor at the court of Rome, wish to keep everyone else suffocated and constrained in matters of the Inquisition, as though they possessed the monarchy of the world." [95] The polemic against Morone reappeared here as well, in the denunciation of unworthy pastors who persecuted those who "went about preaching, especially against the licentious Lutherans," one of whom had tried to obstruct him. [96] There also reappeared a previously unpublished apologetic invective on the Novara affair, dashed off in haste in the form of a *Dialogue between Messer Guglielmo Pontano, Perugian Doctor, and the Reverend Messer Lorenzo Davidico*. On the basis of an analysis of the Novara trial, the renowned Perugian jurist, recently deceased, [97] was made to endorse the version of events offered by his interlocutor, who attributed the confession he had made at Novara to his awareness of the unequal contest in which, alone and without support, he found himself at the mercy of a person far more powerful than he. [98]

At the end of August the priest from Vercelli was in Milan. Despite everything, he felt obliged to write to Morone to deny the slanders of those who said he "wished to play the Aretino" against him - something, he assured him, he would never do "unless cause were given me." [99] There he once again begged to be readmitted among the Barnabites, who nevertheless suggested that "he should go and settle certain affairs he had in Rome and elsewhere too." [100] Everyone from whom he sought help and advice did the same, urging him to avoid rash gestures and retrace his steps as soon as possible in order to relieve his conscience "of all these entanglements." [101] He then tried to return to Perugia, where he still was on 2 October. A few days later, however, abandoned by everyone yet still ready to blame everyone, Don Lorenzo was again in Rome before Friar Michele Ghislieri, this time no longer as a witness but as an accused man. [102] Prison awaited him there, along with difficult interrogations, suspicions of heresy, infamous accusations of blasphemy and sodomy, repeated torture, and a sentence to the galleys. After all, he himself had evoked the threatening specter of the

Inquisition through his denunciations to the cardinal of Carpi and Matteo Lachi - and probably to others - which he was now called upon to confirm. During the long trial the Novara affair and its painful aftermath would soon disappear, buried beneath far more serious problems and conflicts, in which the only role Davidico was called upon to play was that of Morone's accuser.

In his examination of 18 May 1556 he would declare that he had decided to return to Rome out of "remorse of conscience" and above all to contribute to the struggle against heresy, directly or through his disciples, by bringing to the attention of the Holy Office the compelling evidence in his possession against many people, including bishops and cardinals. [103] Yet he was slow to understand the real reasons for the inquisitors' interest in him and in his past dealings with Morone. Hence his anxious oscillation between emphasizing their clashes and attenuating the doctrinal accusations he had made two years earlier, which now threatened to recoil against him and involve him in conflicts wholly disproportionate to his feeble strength. Still uncertain whether he had been summoned "as a witness or as an accuser," but in any case ready to collaborate "constrained by obedience," in his first examination on 8 October 1555 Davidico immediately declared that he possessed no evidence of any sort against anyone, only "suspicions of many," and tried to display confidence that nothing but his reputation as a zealous Catholic could have brought him before the supreme tribunal of the faith. [104]

He therefore began naming a few obscure heterodox individuals encountered in his travels, before turning to his suspicions of Morone, the "great man" whom he said he loved and who loomed in the background of that unexpected summons by the Holy Office. His suspicions extended to some of Morone's collaborators as well, although he now tried to soften them and reduce them to mere "conjecture," to rumors and gossip that he had tried to forget after speaking of them to the cardinal, who "justified himself with many reasons and words." For this reason, although many had advised him against it, he had accepted the invitation to Novara, in part to keep watch over Morone. [105] Bewildered by some of the cardinal's conduct, Davidico had even come to think during those weeks that "if he was a Lutheran (as was said), he had craftily called me to him, either to draw me into some design of his concerning an opinion, or to make some mockery or disgrace of me [...], so that my preaching would no longer have credit." This, he claimed, was precisely what had happened through the unjust trial, persecutions, and violence he had had to endure in the months that followed. Yet although he had no lack of reasons for resentment, Don Lorenzo reaffirmed the conviction, formed on the basis of "many fine Catholic ideas" he had recently heard from Morone, "that this cardinal, considering his rank, is mindful of his salvation and is now in a Catholic state." Uncertain of the inquisitors' aims, the priest from Vercelli drew upon all the resources of his ambiguity: he cast the stone and hid his hand, lending credence to suspicions about Morone while at the same time declaring himself certain of his orthodoxy.

Two days later he was summoned again to answer for his hasty flight from Rome and his imprudent letter to the cardinal of Carpi. But his invocation of supposed enemies eager to harm him, his confused evasions, his professions of religious zeal and of "Christian conduct and faithful labor in the vineyard of God," and his claim to be now "determined to enter God's service under obedience among the priests of Saint Paul in Milan or of Jesus here in Rome" only irritated the inquisitors. They soon grew impatient with his digressions and wanted only to obtain fresh evidence concerning Morone. Michele Ghislieri therefore lost his temper and accused him of lying, pointing out that he knew Davidico had said in various places and to various persons things which, if true, would show that Morone was not merely suspected of heresy but was a true heretic. [106] In questioning Don Lorenzo, something the latter did not know, Friar Michele had before him the deposition Matteo Lachi had given three months earlier, on 15-16 July, an extract from which appears in the priest's trial file. [107] Called to testify in the inquiry against Morone, the former inquisitor of Perugia had spoken chiefly of the suspicions that had been at the center of his conversations and correspondence with Davidico before, during, and after the stay in Novara. [108]

Confronted with verbatim quotations of what he had once said to Lachi, Don Lorenzo could do nothing but confirm them. Yet, still convinced that his present predicament resulted precisely from the suspicions he had imprudently spread, he hastened to assure the judges that his doubts concerning the Milanese cardinal's orthodoxy had later disappeared and that in the past he had spoken only with the intention "of helping, not

maligning or blackening anyone's reputation." Hence his willingness to ask Morone's forgiveness "if in some circumstance" - and he sighed - "through my imprudence I had offended him." [109] An obvious misunderstanding thus marked this first phase of the trial: the judges were disoriented by the accused's reticence, incomprehensible in their eyes except as the effect of dark complicities after what he himself had previously revealed to the cardinal of Carpi and others; and Davidico was unable to play the role assigned to him, a prisoner both of the Holy Office and of his own uncontrollable opportunism.

In the next examination, on 12 October, he again insisted on his "good opinion of the faith and doctrine" of Morone and on the "great edification" he had subsequently drawn from the cardinal's words: "He behaved toward me in a most Christian manner, embraced me with great charity, and forgave me for everything in which I might have offended him." From this perspective he sought to confine his suspicions to the brief Novara period and to limit to a few points the accusations he had made in November 1553 "under the seal of confession" to the cardinal of Carpi and repeated soon afterward to Lachi. With disarming candor he declared himself ready to retract everything by saying "one word in satisfaction of my conscience to Monsignor of Carpi and Father Friar Matteo: namely, that at that time I was truly of such an opinion, and now I hold another view." Davidico believed such statements demonstrated his full willingness to go to Canossa, abandon his habit of needling the powerful, and make amends. To the judges, however, they seemed calculated to exasperate them. Still more irritating must have appeared the proposal Don Lorenzo advanced in this interrogation, in an increasingly desperate attempt to extricate himself from the web of his lies: a fanciful extrajudicial expedient that would allow him to leave prison and bring them astonishing successes. In particular, he invoked two "old courtiers" of Morone, men "of good mind" with whom he had enjoyed "spiritual conversation." It would not be difficult, he said, to sound them out in "secret conversation" and determine whether there was still anything "rotten" in their patron. He likewise had no lack of "spiritual sons" connected with Morone in Milan, Modena, and Bologna. Thus it would not be hard to gather information about him, if that was what the judges wanted, "although I hold nothing but a good opinion of him, for God knows how much I love and revere him." [110]

This proposal became more precise in the following interrogation of 16 October. Although he continued defending the cardinal, now extending his defense to Pole and Priuli as well, Davidico convinced himself that a change of strategy was necessary. "Utterly confused and desperate," he threw himself at Friar Michele's feet and admitted his faults in fleeing Rome and later writing to the cardinal of Carpi that he did not wish to be "a spy of the Inquisition." If he had remedied the first error by presenting himself voluntarily, he could redeem the second by becoming "a diligent investigator of Lutherans": [111]

> In every city I have many lay persons inclined to the good who obey me out of love and frequent the sacraments. Since I have probable reason to suspect that there are innumerable hidden Lutherans, by means of such persons, acting secretly and charitably, I would obtain indications from place to place without trouble or commotion. I am able to stir up the groups of these spiritual children in each place to do this out of zeal for Catholic truth and a desire to strip their presence of such Lutheran tares, and I am all the more fitted to do so because I have hands everywhere. Thus I promise, if given a patent with some authority and allowed to remain fifteen or twenty days in each city, to deliver two hundred or more of them into your hands. I especially suspect that in certain particular cities there are hidden nests of such poisonous serpents, such as Vicenza, Padua, Venice, Lucca, and Modena, as well as Genoa and Milan. Through men of this kind who walk in truth, and by divine grace, I promise to discover them and from time to time provide you with clear and evident indications.

The proposal was obviously unacceptable. Don Lorenzo hoped to win his freedom by transforming himself from an accused man into an inquisitor, and Ghislieri accordingly recalled him to his duty to answer questions rather than waste time on such extravagances. Yet the proposal was consistent with the image of himself Davidico continued striving to present, boasting of hosts of disciples throughout Italy. He would insist upon it throughout his long imprisonment, with disastrous results but stubborn tenacity, never abandoning his vocation for confusing reality and appearance, truth and falsehood, religious commitment and cynical opportunism, obstinately trying to sell the spoiled wares of his supposed holiness.

Already then, barely a week after his arrest, Davidico's interrogations could be regarded as substantially exhausted. What he had to say about Morone had been entered into the record, to the inquisitors' disappointment, since only with difficulty and considerable qualification had they succeeded in making him confirm what appeared in Lachi's deposition. Yet Don Lorenzo remained in prison, perhaps awaiting some new development in the inquiry into the Milanese cardinal that might provide grounds for summoning him again, but also because of the reckless initiatives with which he helped complicate his already difficult situation, beginning with the letter he addressed to Friar Michele at the end of October 1555. [112]

Increasingly convinced that his past accusations against the Milanese cardinal had plunged him into the abyss where he now found himself, he continued attributing what he had told the cardinal of Carpi and Lachi to the "unfavorable opinion I then held of him" and assuring the judges that he had never again "spoken of His Most Reverend Lordship except well and with every reverence." Completely misguided in his defensive strategy, he turned on Lachi and demanded that he too be imprisoned so that he might uphold his statements through the same sufferings Davidico had endured. Though himself under investigation, he could think of nothing better than to vent his rage against an inquisitor who enjoyed the complete confidence of the Holy Office, blaming him for having "defamed Monsignor Morone, my patron, together with the other Most Reverend prelates [...], by making public judgment of what I had disclosed under the seal of confession." With artless effrontery Don Lorenzo even presumed to suggest to his judges the course they should follow: "If you wish Monsignor Morone to be justified, nothing better can be done than to impose silence on such matters." As for himself, they need only let him "go into God's service" and devote himself to hunting "hidden Lutherans," with the promise that in a short time he would cause figures such as Vergerio, Mainardi, and Giulio da Milano to be arrested. Once again proclaiming his zeal as a "professor and defender of Catholic truth," Davidico offered himself to the inquisitors as a valuable collaborator, though his sole aim was to leave prison and escape Rome.

It is hardly surprising that an increasingly furious Michele Ghislieri preferred to ignore such a letter, just as he ignored Davidico's constant attempts to convince the tribunal of the sensational results his disciples could achieve in the struggle against heresy. [113] The examination of 21 November was the last directed by Ghislieri. From then on the case was handled by Giovan Battista Bizzoni, assessor and ordinary judge of the causes of the Holy Office, who was equally unwilling to be drawn into the tangle of lies, deceptions, repentances, and childish tricks by which the priest from Vercelli imagined he could mollify and even manipulate his judges. Incapable of any consistency and always suspended between arrogance and humility, Davidico found himself "in extreme need, [...] between hammer and anvil," as Lorenzo Pancaldi wrote to the Milanese Barnabites on 25 April 1556. [114] It did him no good to invent a vast network of followers who, at his signal, would denounce a multitude of heretics hidden everywhere, even in the papal city, among them bishops and cardinals whom he could not personally name because of the seal of confession. Nor did his ravings about one of those cardinals, "a hidden monster such as no other cardinal is," so powerful that he was even "spoken of and ambitious for the papacy," in whose house Davidico swore he had seen dozens of heterodox books and whole bundles of letters from heretics, including one from John Calvin himself addressing him as "Monsignor, beloved by all of us in fraternal affection." [115] Still less useful was his boast that he received frequent nocturnal visits in prison from an imaginary Agostino, an expert in enchantments through which "he could enter everywhere," and from his friend Niccolò, an unrepentant heretic, associate of the cardinal "monster," and necromancer capable of preparing a deadly poison that left no trace in its victims. [116]

Nor could his boast that the heretics of the Grisons had nicknamed him "the Papist" save him from the torture to which he was subjected on 9 June. Even then, however, hanging from the rope, smeared with his own excrement, amid stabbing pain, pleas for pity, prayers, lamentations, and cries of rage that punctuated that hour of humiliating suffering, Davidico did not abandon his absurd defense. He refused to violate the supposed seal of confession behind which he sheltered, but promised that as soon as he left prison he would reveal numerous heterodox persons, including that great cardinal "who might become pope and would be a monster in the Church of God. Oh, what evil his power would do!" [117] Perhaps it was at that moment, pressed

by the inquisitors' questions, that he finally understood why he was there. Until then - evidently unaware of the dense web the inquisitors were weaving against Morone - he had continued to call him his "father and patron," declaring himself guilty only of having failed at first to "warn him with the charity and modesty I ought" and then, after hearing him "speak so Catholicly," of failing to retract his accusations before those to whom he had expressed them. [118] But now, after the many rash gestures he had committed in prison, with no one left willing to believe his tales, Don Lorenzo finally grasped that his chief fault lay in failing to understand the role assigned to him by the Holy Office. [119] When, at the end of the torture, the notary told him that his "defect" consisted in having shown "too much regard in revealing the truth against that person whom you know," Davidico, still in pain, could only assent, uttering with a desolate sigh "that word, 'Morone,' in a low voice." [120] But by then it was too late to turn back, since denying what he had previously affirmed would also discredit his new version of events. At that point he no longer held any interest for the inquisitors, who could simply forget him. "Nothing is heard about Davidico; he is left there to rot," Pancaldi wrote to Milan on 5 September 1556. [121] It fell to Davidico to remind the judges of his existence, pressing for interviews and submitting writings intended to convince them of the importance of what might be discovered through his disciples, with allusions to ever more astonishing affairs. It was now useless to admit that "if there is an error in my examination, it lies in the regard I showed Monsignor Morone" and finally decide to accuse him, albeit obliquely, in ambiguous and poisonous words. [122] Equally useless was the fantasy that he could convince the tribunal that he had secretly written dozens upon dozens of letters to his "penitents" and duly received their replies, including those of the "head of these heretics of Rome" and others concerning the Milanese cardinal, [123] one of whose servants was allegedly worried about his imprisonment for fear that he might say "something about his patron." [124] No one was now willing to listen to him.

It is difficult to say which offense was addressed by the sentence of 22 October 1556 condemning Davidico to the galleys. [125] It did not, however, interrupt the proceedings, which continued with the presentation of the defense in November. There he again proposed his suspicions concerning Morone and recalled what, at the beginning of the 1550s, the then commissioner of the Roman Holy Office, Teofilo Scullica, had told him on seeing him leave Morone's palace: "My cardinal [Gian Pietro Carafa] and I hold him for a Lutheran. If we had a pope after our own mind, you would see something fine." [126] The trial was now over, although Davidico himself was the last to realize it. Incapable of keeping silent and still, he continued to enrage judges who could no longer endure being led by the nose by that reckless liar, all the more irritating because he remained unwilling to cast off the role of exemplary religious and zealous hunter of heretics. Yet that role was not merely the fiction of an incurable liar or the precarious raft of a man adrift. Perhaps it was also the last shred of identity to which Don Lorenzo could appeal in the tragic shipwreck of his life. Only in this way can one understand how he continued writing long memorials, such as the one delivered to Bizzoni on 31 December, in which he repeated for the umpteenth time his tortuous boasts and announced further sensational news about Morone. This time he reported that "there are four or five canonical and secular witnesses in Novara who, if questioned according to the circumstances and articles I have in a memorial, will sing beautifully; [...] likewise three or four in Milan, and here there are three of mine, one of whom is Bolognese and knew him for a long time *ante promotionem eius et dum esset Bononiae legatus* [before his promotion to the cardinalate and while he was legate in Bologna]." And so too on Cardinal Bertano; on the "monster" and his correspondence with Calvin; and on illustrious figures carefully selected among those Davidico knew Pope Carafa disliked: Fulvio Della Cornia, cardinal of Perugia and nephew of Julius III; certain unspecified "servants of Catholic lords, in my judgment perhaps of the duke of Florence, of the cardinal of Mantua, and of Trent, my patrons"; Filippo Archinto; a bishop who absolved heretics for money or in exchange for barrels of good wine; the bishop of Pavia, Giovangirolamo de' Rossi, mentioned earlier and now called "an absolute Lutheran" together with his Florentine accomplices; and then heterodox persons from Ferrara, Verona, Vicenza, Milan, and Rome. [127]

By now, however, no one paid the slightest attention to Davidico's ramblings. He was left to languish in prison for another two months before, on 5 March 1557, Ghislieri signed the sentence condemning him to the galleys at the pleasure of the Holy See, [128] that is, until he had shown suitable signs of repentance. It was a severe punishment, wholly devoid of doctrinal implications and motivated solely by his flight from Rome in

1555; the letter in which he had told the cardinal of Carpi that he did not wish to be a “spy” of the Holy Office; repeated escape attempts; the slanders and lies uttered during the trial; and the illicit absolution of heretics *in utroque foro*. There was no mention of his reticence concerning Morone and the spirituali, or of the blasphemies and impieties of which a cellmate had accused him. There was therefore no abjuration, only the most infamous of punishments for ordinary crimes. At the end of the month he was at Ostia, chained to an oar. Yet even in that hell of misery, violence, and denunciation that emerges from the records of later interrogations, Davidico did not cease writing letters to his disciples and to prelates he knew, asking them to intervene on his behalf. He succeeded only in once again irritating the leaders of the Holy Office, who in mid-May ordered him returned to the Ripetta prisons, [129] perhaps also so that he would be available for Morone’s now imminent arrest. In the examination of 9 June, indeed, he himself told the judges that he knew of the cardinal’s imprisonment and appeared horrified at the prospect of a direct confrontation. [130]

After three months in the galleys, the trial seemed to begin all over again, with Davidico stubbornly entrenched behind the seal of confession in the vain attempt to bargain with the Holy Office in the name of the great successes against heretics that would result from his release. Exhortations, rebukes, and threats failed to make him retreat from the path he had taken and could no longer leave without admitting that he had nothing with which to bargain. Even the atrocious pain of a new torture only hardened him in his obstinacy. “You will get nothing else from me, and you will cripple me”; “you can kill me”; “I would rather die here than tell you,” he shouted, swearing that he would never speak “by force,” although he was prepared to do so “with kindness.” But as soon as he was lowered, he again requested a private meeting with one of the inquisitors and asked for time “to reflect a little upon it.” [131] His attempt to bribe a cellmate to attest the improbable nocturnal visits of mysterious persons carrying bundles of letters from his “penitents” earned him only another torture, [132] again useless in overcoming his desperate resistance and his clinging to the castle of lies he had constructed. “When you have my writings, you will have what I have said about Morone and all the others,” he insisted, begging for a few more days: “Put me to death - kill me on Sunday if you do not have them! Kill me Sunday! [...] Shall I deliver them into your hands between now and tomorrow *per viam indirectam salva mea conscientia*?” In the end the tribunal gave up, convinced that it would be entirely useless to continue along that road with a man who, almost unaware of the abyss into which he had fallen, returned to speaking of the “great anger” he had felt against Cardinal Alessandrino, “because it seemed strange to me to have been put in prison as a heretic, when I was Catholic.” [133]

Only in August 1559 would Davidico leave prison, freed not by a decree of the congregation but by the rage of the Roman populace, which after the death of Paul IV turned upon the symbols of his power, foremost among them the palace and prisons of the Holy Office. [134] His odyssey, however, was not yet over. Reaching Venice at the end of March 1560, he presented himself to one of his followers, a priest who, though aware of his Roman imprisonment, assisted him with a benevolent letter of introduction addressed on 29 March to Paolo and Alvise Dal Corno, both physicians belonging to a prominent Trevisan family, who did not deny him hospitality. [135] There he resumed hearing confessions and preaching, again assuming the devout image to which he had so often entrusted his fortunes, and continued to bombard “many cardinals” with letters pressing for a definitive conclusion to his case. Someone in Rome did indeed concern himself with him, but it was not the Holy Office. It was Berardo Bongiovanni, bishop of Camerino, who during a short stop in Treviso on his journey to the Polish nunciature ordered the diocesan vicar, Giulio Avogari, to have Davidico arrested wherever he might be found, informing him that he had received a “special commission” from the pontiff himself. Bongiovanni was very close to Morone and had defended him during the trial. [136] It may therefore be hypothesized that the initiative came from the Milanese cardinal himself, now absolved and enjoying the full support of Pius IV, who was undoubtedly interested in learning what Don Lorenzo had said about him during his long Roman detention.

This explains why the arrest warrant was not transmitted to Treviso through the ordinary nuncio, but entrusted specifically to Bongiovanni. He exerted strong pressure but could produce no formal document supporting the request, leading Avogari to demand a written order and seek the *placet* of the nuncio in Venice. The podestà’s constables had no difficulty capturing Davidico, who was recovering from a delicate

surgical operation, and he was immediately confined “at the bottom of the tower of the bishop’s palace.” Alvise and Paolo Dal Corno, however, together with another physician who had become Don Lorenzo’s disciple during those months, used his very poor health as a pretext to have him transferred to a more wholesome room. From there he managed to escape during the night and then take refuge in the Valtellina, adding a new and spectacular episode to the turbulent events of his life. In the following years he would wander between Bologna and Trent, Genoa and Asti, Padua and Vercelli, Casale and Cremona, Turin and Venice, Naples and Milan. There, at the end of 1564, Carlo Borromeo had him arrested at the request of the Roman Holy Office. [137] Perhaps it was then that he succeeded in obtaining a sentence allowing him to resume his wanderings, eventually reaching Vercelli once more in 1567. The bishop, Cardinal Guido Ferrero, called him to participate in the diocesan synod and charged him with preaching and visiting the city parishes. [138]

He would die there in 1575, after spending the last years of his life as parish priest of Sant’Agnese, [139] by then tired and ill, though he never ceased knocking at the door of the mother house of the Clerics of Saint Paul and exhorting them to settle in Vercelli, in letters that always oscillated between passionate praise of their religious life, bitter awareness of his own failures, and acid resentment at their rejections. [140]

4. “Morone [...] Remains in Prison as Though They Had Forgotten Him”

While Davidico’s odyssey ran its course, Morone’s trial had slowly advanced. The end of the war against Spain, sealed by the peace of Cave on 14 September 1557, brought a sudden acceleration, almost as though Paul IV sought compensation for his humiliating military and political defeat. The investigative phase closed on 4 October 1557 with the delivery of twenty-one *articuli* of accusation, [141] whose drafting by the fiscal prosecutor was preceded by several opinions on the evidence gathered thus far. [142] According to inquisitorial procedure, even if the accused remained “obstinate in denying,” it was necessary “to offer the repetition” of the witnesses, “to be conducted with the interrogatories of the accused himself.” [143] The proceedings thus entered a new phase. The *testes informativi* examined earlier would first be questioned on the counterarguments to the articles presented by the accused, the so-called *interrogatoria*, and then on the articles themselves, with the duty to provide circumstantial answers “without referring back to their earlier statements.” [144] After availing himself of the right to consult his “proctors, advocates, and others,” as he wrote to his sister, [145] Morone delivered thirty-nine *interrogatoria* to the tribunal within the prescribed period of three days. [146] He accompanied them with a formal protest in which, besides challenging some witnesses as his notorious enemies and therefore prejudicially hostile, he requested an extension so that he could draft his questions with greater deliberation, as well as disclosure of the names of all who had thus far been examined, in order that he might better clarify the events and episodes from which the charges arose. [147] The tribunal’s negative response did not prevent him from submitting on 6 November a second version of the *interrogatoria*, divided into forty points and containing minor changes and additions. [148]

Few and confused reports about the charges filtered beyond the prison: that he had read “prohibited books, and in particular the [...] *Beneficio di Cristo*”; that he had “ordered one preacher to exhort people to confession but not to dispute whether it was *de iure divino vel humano*”; and another “to preach certain Lutheran chapters.” [149] Whether false or approximate, these reports nevertheless provoked very anxious comment. “The objections made against Cardinal Morone are very ugly, if true, and precisely such as only a madman would make,” Ercole Gonzaga wrote to Pietro Bertano on 16 October, though he declared himself skeptical of their truth. That same day Navagero reported to Venice that the Milanese cardinal’s servants were saying “that he is being murdered and [...] that things are objected against him which not merely a wise man until now judged good, but even the most wicked madman, would never have said.” They also made it known, however, that he would be able to produce documents capable of exonerating him, especially letters sent to his vicar in Modena exhorting him “to put on trial and persecute certain heretics who held the very opinions now alleged against him.” Meanwhile the pontiff lost no opportunity to tell the cardinals that “for the love of God they should beware of making pope anyone suspected of heresy, because it would be the final ruin of Christendom, and that they knew well the danger run in past conclaves.” For his part, he pledged

to make every possible “provision to prevent such a thing, [...] since he would not remain alive for another hundred years.” [150]

“It is believed that they will wish to conclude this judgment so that Cardinal Carafa may report its outcome to the Catholic king,” a Roman newsletter reported on 9 October 1557. [151] The resumption of the trial must indeed be connected with Carlo Carafa’s mission to Brussels to address the many problems left unresolved after the end of the war. On that occasion the cardinal-nephew carried with him extracts from the inquisitorial documentation gathered thus far concerning Pole and Morone, in order to let the Catholic king see their gravity, as had been promised to the duke of Alba, and thus persuade him that the proceedings promoted by the pope were well founded. Once at Philip II’s court, Carafa delivered those papers to him “for his enlightenment.” They should have been most secret, but having learned of the influence exercised upon the king by his confessor, the Franciscan Bernardo de Fresneda, Carafa also showed the latter “all the examinations, so that he might be prepared when occasion arose to speak of them.” [152] During those months a complex game of influence and pressure developed around the sovereign and Fresneda, whom reading the trial papers convinced of Morone’s guilt, [153] analogous to that of Pole and the hated Carranza, whom he regarded as no less a heretic than Luther. [154] In a letter to Carlo Carafa of 20 June 1558, Fresneda also expressed his suspicions concerning Pole, Priuli, and other members of Pole’s household, who in his judgment concealed some secret evil. [155] But Carranza too was in Brussels, Pole’s friend since the years of the conciliar legation and later in England, whose recent appointment as archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain revealed the great favor he enjoyed with the sovereign. [156] Filippo Gheri was there as well. During Morone’s imprisonment he worked on the cardinal’s behalf at the court of the Catholic king and also traveled to London to confer with Pole, who on 7 November 1557 recommended him to Carranza. [157]

As Gualteruzzi hoped in a letter sent to Beccadelli on 8 December 1557, “if King Philip is willing to do part of what he can, the poor lord [Morone] will be freed, since the pope too wants things from His Majesty.” Ottavio Farnese, duke of Parma, would likewise write to the Habsburg court on behalf of the Milanese cardinal, a fact of which his wife, Margaret of Austria, informed Morone’s sister in Milan on 7 February 1558. [158] At the same time, still in Brussels, a cautious but active effort on behalf of Morone and Pole was undertaken by the Jesuits accompanying Carafa, Pedro de Ribadeneira and Alfonso Salmerón. From Rome Polanco and Laínez commended to them those “cardinal friends” under accusation and suggested influencing the Catholic king through Fresneda. To document Morone’s orthodoxy, the leaders of the Society sent to Brussels the text of the pastoral instructions for the diocese of Novara that he had had printed in 1554, [159] thus attempting to counter the cardinal-nephew’s work of persuasion. From Brussels the Jesuit fathers replied by stressing the need to act with extreme caution, but they established contact with Carranza, [160] whose consecration as archbishop Granvelle celebrated on 27 February. The pamphlet by Morone sent from Rome was entrusted to him, and he gave assurance that he would intervene with the sovereign. [161] As for speaking about it with Fresneda, Ribadeneira and Salmerón soon understood that this would be inadvisable. [162] At least, however, they seized the opportunity to say every manner of evil about the pope and his nephews, as Antonio Elio, bishop of Pola, then in the entourage of

Carlo Carafa, who would describe Salmerón as a man “insolent and in a certain way scandalous in his sermons,” recalling the effrontery with which he had dared to say publicly that “Paul IV knew theology only superficially” and to rail against the prelates in the cardinal-nephew’s entourage. [163]

A substantial body of documentation makes it possible to reconstruct the dense web of interventions, judgments, and comments that then grew up around Morone’s trial, which was followed closely not only by relatives, friends, and members of his household, but throughout Italy and Europe, amid a constant alternation of disappointments and hopes, partly because of the secrecy maintained by the commission charged with the case. “It is difficult to penetrate it,” Navagero wrote on 13 November 1557, because only the pope and the four cardinals knew what was happening, “for not even the other cardinals of the Inquisition know of it.” Indeed, no trace of it remains in the minutes of the Holy Office’s *Decreta*, any more than of the trial of Carnesecchi, who was summoned to Rome on 25 October (“the common report is that this summons proceeds from his being regarded as a very intimate servant of Cardinals Pole and Morone,” Pietro Gelido commented from Venice). [164] In October the *repetitiones* of Alfonso Salmerón and Matteo Lachi were heard, and the deposition of another Dominican friar was entered into the record. [165] Three times in the first half of November the commission went to Castel Sant’Angelo to question the accused cardinal, while before the end of the month the lengthy *repetitio* of Fra Bernardo Bartoli was also recorded. [166] Far from having been tempered by the heavy military defeat, then, the wind blowing through the Curia threatened a storm for Morone.

The following year, while the outcome of Carlo Carafa’s mission was awaited, the proceedings advanced with exasperating slowness. “Morone’s affairs are asleep and dragging on,” it was written on 12 January 1558. Three days later, at the end of the customary Thursday meeting, a member of the Holy Office let slip that “many will be summoned who do not expect it.” [167] He was undoubtedly referring also to Cardinal Pietro Bertano, who died shortly afterward, on 8 March. [168] Pope Carafa spoke of him in blazing terms, saying that “he did well to die, because I was resolved to put him in the Castle as a Lutheran,” thus associating him with Pole and Morone, as the Florentine ambassador reported on 15 April 1558. [169] His death also opened the delicate question of succession to the diocese of Fano. As early as January, Ercole Gonzaga had taken care to sound out opinion about a possible appointment of Filippo Gheri, but his Roman agent Bernardino Pia immediately advised against it, informing him that Morone’s secretary “is ill regarded and under investigation at this court.” [170] In March, however, the Cardinal of Mantua - to whom his Milanese colleague had sent an urgent appeal from prison on the matter 171 - dispatched Provost Ippolito Ghisi to Rome with instructions to contact those inquisitors whom he knew he could trust. Ghisi soon warned him of the danger involved in officially proposing such an appointment, while the cardinals he consulted - Puteo, Pacheco, and Sforza of Santa Fiora - also wrote personally to urge him to abandon the plan, [172] since its political meaning and the explicit support from Morone that it implied were all too evident, almost a provocation in the pope’s eyes.

On 19 February 1558 a Roman newswriter reported that “examinations and trials” were continuing and that therefore “one must have patience until it pleases God.” On 2 March it was written to Ferrara that Morone “has not once been visited since mid-November by the four cardinals of the Inquisition who usually examine him, so that he remains in prison as though they had forgotten him.” [173] A report that reached Venice on 25 May, and was immediately forwarded by Gualteruzzi to Beccadelli in distant Ragusa, effectively clarified the terms of the matter: [174]

> The pope had sent four cardinals - Trani, Pisa, Alessandrino, and Reumano - to visit Morone and apologize that his trial had taken so long to conclude, because this had been caused by the business of peace. But now that peace was entirely despaired of, he wished to proceed with the case, in the hope of finding him innocent, which was his desire, so that he might show him the benevolence of his spirit; and even if he were found to have fallen into some of those errors that today may be called common, he did not wish any account to be taken of them, but would restore him to his love and favor. To these words Cardinal Morone replied very prudently, saying that whatever His Holiness did in his case he would regard as very well done, knowing that all his actions were always reasonable and honorable. It is judged that this benign

manner of proceeding is intended to wait and see whether King Philip will be victorious over France and, in the meantime, to keep every side in play, as the signs indicate.

In any event, the failure of the mission to Philip II was hardly the best premise for inducing Paul IV to lay down the sword that, as Pole wrote to him with great dignity on 30 March 1558, he had drawn "against all of us." [175] In February, with the failure of the task entrusted to the cardinal-nephew now evident, the trial was set in motion again. During the summer, meanwhile, the impenetrable secrecy that had hitherto surrounded it was broken by the publication of a pamphlet containing the twenty-one articles of accusation, accompanied by a harsh anti-papal commentary by Vergerio, [176] who was evidently able to draw upon obscure links with the highest levels of the Curia. With the pope increasingly impatient to reach the desired condemnation, the continuing delay of the proceedings seemed to justify the bleakest predictions. From Venice on 15 March 1558 Pietro Gelido reported to Cosimo de' Medici the rumors that "the pope intends to deprive Cardinal Morone on account of heresy"; ten days later the new Venetian ambassador in Rome, Alvise Mocenigo, said he had learned that "objections greater than the first" had been discovered against him. On 15 April Gianfigliazzi informed the Duke of Florence that Morone's servants were now closely watched and that "no one is any longer allowed to speak with the cardinal, and the food brought from his house morning and evening is inspected minutely, so it is clear that he is kept under close restraint and is in poor spirits." On the 26th, from Venice, Gualteruzzi confided his bitter pessimism to Beccadelli: "No good can be hoped for anyone from anyone; and unless God in his goodness helps innocence itself, all our friends and patrons will come to a bad end." Carnesecchi thought the same, sadly informing Donna Giulia on 4 May that "Morone's affairs" were "more desperate than ever." [177]

Shortly afterward even Juan Manrique de Lara, who had become Morone's personal friend during his years in Rome as Charles V's ambassador and had just been appointed viceroy of Naples, found himself, at least verbally, caught in the inquisitorial cyclone unleashed by Pope Carafa. A prisoner of his anti-Spanish fury, the pope did not hesitate to go about saying "that he is a thoroughgoing Lutheran and belongs to Cardinal Morone's school." [178] The gesture of the new emperor, Ferdinand I, was therefore highly significant: on 22 September 1558 he wrote to the Milanese cardinal, his "dearest friend," asking him to intervene as far as he could in the difficult situation he faced over the conferral of several bishoprics in his hereditary dominions. [179] A few months later, during a conversation with the Mantuan ambassador, Ferdinand did not restrain his indignation toward the pope. "It grieves me exceedingly," he said, "that because of his harshness and obstinate nature all Christendom suffers infinite harm. I pray our Lord God in his goodness to enlighten him and make him recognize the path that a true head of the Holy Church must follow." [180] In mid-September 1558 Egidio Foscarari, Morone's successor in the bishopric of Modena, was likewise summoned to Rome for questioning and was then himself imprisoned in January, on the charge of having sent the cardinal certain letters to the vicar that would have been useful to the defense, and above all of having caused other letters to disappear that might instead have documented the heterodox instructions given to Bartoli in 1543. [181]

Meanwhile, after the *repetitiones* of Bartolomeo della Pergola and Antonio Gadaldino had been recorded in Ripetta prison on 6 and 7 February, Fra Tommaso Scotti set out again in March to hear other witnesses in Bologna and Florence. But the inquiry was now running out of material: Pole and all his household were unreachable in distant England; Carnesecchi was unreachable, protected by Venetian *libertas* and still more by Cosimo de' Medici; Filippo Valentini and Ludovico Castelvetro were unreachable, now exiles beyond the Alps; Pietro Bertano and Vittore Soranzo were unreachable, having died in Rome on 8 March and in Venice on 13 May 1558. Morone's trial could therefore hardly undergo significant further developments. The last depositions entered into the record - those of Bishops Girolamo Muzzarelli, Giacomo Giacomelli, and Scipione Bongalli 182 - no longer possessed the explosive accusatory force of those of Giovan Battista Scotti, Matteo Lachi, and Bernardo Bartoli. The inquisitors could derive some new elements from them, but nothing capable of substantially strengthening the case for the prosecution. On 22 August Marcantonio Villamarina was able to leave prison after abjuring. [183]

Morone's own interrogations were likewise moving toward a weary conclusion, as were those of Domenico Morando, that large and burly Modenese who to the very end - even under torture - swore to his

patron's complete orthodoxy, although the trial reveals that he himself had adhered to the doctrine of justification by faith alone after meeting Pole at Trent in 1542-43. [184] The cardinal was summoned before the inquisitorial commission only twice more, on 15 June 1558 and, fully nine months later, on 20 March 1559. [185] The time had now come to close the accusatory phase of the trial and grant the defendant the so-called defenses.

The weary dragging-on of the trial month after month, until Paul IV gave it new impetus in the summer of 1559, on the eve of his death, reflected not only the uncertainties of the European political situation between Charles V's death at Yuste on 21 September 1558 and the peace signed at Cateau-Cambrésis on 2 April of the following year. It also reflected the collapse of the old pope's physical and mental condition, as he became ever more captive to his obsessive heretical phantoms. "I hear nothing about Morone that pleases me, and the same of England; yet death will remedy everything, unless it delays longer than is hoped, though in any case it will delay longer than is desired," [186] Carnesecchi wrote to Gonzaga, venting his anguish and anger. The prospect of a conclave suggested to the cardinal-nephew that he should accommodate Philip II, who hurried to send a new ambassador to Rome, Don Juan de Figueroa - himself immediately suspected of heresy 187 - and on 25 September sent him a list of candidates he trusted, with Morone in first place. [188] For this reason Carafa had tried at the Brussels court to distance himself from his uncle's inflexible inquisitorial rigor. In the spring of 1558, during the return journey to Italy, he had not concealed from Cristoforo Madruzzo, a cardinal of unquestioned imperial loyalty, his concern at the imminent "fall of the pear, which already seems quite ripe," and at the mediocrity of the "Theatines and friars" whom Paul IV had called into the Sacred College. [189] Shortly afterward, in Venice, the cardinal-nephew had a secret meeting with Carnesecchi, [190] to whom he gave some assurances for the future; and on returning to Rome in mid-September he tried to induce Paul IV to take a milder course toward Morone as well. Negotiations for the papal succession had already begun, in other words, and the Milanese cardinal too had cards to play in them: [191]

> They also write that His Beatitude's relatives are pressing him to release Cardinal Morone, but in such a way that he will recognize that his liberation is due to them, and that he should create a whole herd of new cardinals; to both proposals His Beatitude has so far obstinately objected. Yet because those named for the cardinalate are men with well-filled purses, it is believed that they will press him so hard that they will make him do this and more. If he does so, however, it will be a sign that little of his life now remains.

Certainly, in the eyes of Paul IV, as of men such as Michele Ghislieri and Scipione Rebiba, the results of the inquiry must have seemed more than sufficient to issue a sentence of condemnation, entailing at least deprivation of the cardinalate and hence exclusion from any future conclave. But anyone who had had the opportunity to read the trial records could easily have seen that the accusations referred for the most part to events more than ten years earlier, to a period before the Tridentine decrees - as the defendant himself had emphasized in his *confessio* 192 - and that, moreover, they were advanced by persons of little prestige if not wholly discredited: friars themselves under investigation and therefore open to blackmail, such as Bartoli and Pergola; outright adventurers such as Davidico; or informers of the Inquisition such as Scotti. Philip II's refusal to follow the pope down this path, as well as the evident dissociation from his choices by distinguished members of the Sacred College - Farnese, Gonzaga, Madruzzo, Santa Fiora, Pacheco, and Puteo - showed that such a trial could hardly establish Morone's guilt with the dazzling clarity required by his rank, his political authority, and his reputation as an exemplary prelate.

Chapter Seventeen

“Morone Will Come Out Once His Holiness Has Closed His Eyes”: From Paul IV to Pius IV

1. “There Was No Need for So Many Trials, Writings, or Justifications, nor to Observe Procedures”

Wounded in his personal dignity, his boundless pride, and his image as an uncompromising reformer by the discovery of the thefts and crimes perpetrated by his nephews, during the last months of his life Paul IV seemed intent on concerning himself only with the Holy Office. The conclusion of Morone’s trial became the center of his attention, with the anxiety that death might prevent him from issuing an exemplary sentence that would sanction once and for all the triumph of the tenacious political and religious action to which he had devoted himself since the beginning of the 1530s. “They say that the most reverend Morone will soon be dispatched, but not as his friends desire,” reads a report of 10 October 1558, while according to Carnesecchi he was “in a worse position than ever,” as shown by the new searches of his house and Foscarari’s summons to Rome. [1] A month later Gianfigliazzi informed Cosimo de’ Medici that “now more than ever they are attending to the trial against Cardinal Morone, bringing forward new matters because they judge that by this means they can deprive him of the papacy.” On the 26th an agent of the Gonzaga reported rumors that Paul IV had now decided “to proceed to Cardinal Morone’s deprivation, justifying it by the many indications and witnesses examined.” Pietro Antonio Di Capua too was summoned to Rome, “as an instrument with which to attack Morone’s innocence,” Carnesecchi surmised; on 17 December he informed Gonzaga of “His Holiness’s very evil disposition toward the said Morone; and it is no news to me that he will do the worst he can.” [2] “The affairs of the most reverend Morone are going extremely badly,” a Roman report confirmed on 21 January 1559; according to another of 4 February, “it appears that matters are closing in very badly against His Most Reverend Lordship and that they are considering the form of a sentence to deprive him in the first consistories that are held.” On the same day the Florentine protonotary observed that only “sad news from every quarter” was being heard. [3]

As proof that, feeling death draw near, Paul IV intended to bind his successors to his inquisitorial policy, in the consistory of 16 December 1558 he had Cardinal Alessandrino solemnly swear the oath for his new office as *summus et perpetuus inquisitor* - entrusted to him “especially on Morone’s account,” Carnesecchi immediately thought 4 - and published the severe bull against secret agreements in preparation for conclaves, *Cum secundum Apostolum*. It did not mention cardinals under investigation only because he intended to issue a special measure against them. [5] At the beginning of February 1559, in fact, the consistory debated at length a decree against those guilty of heresy, which took shape in the bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio*, issued on the 15th. It declared null the possible election to the papacy of anyone who had departed from orthodoxy and deprived cardinals suspected of any doctrinal deviation of both active and passive voice in conclave. [6] Everyone understood that the measure was aimed above all at Morone, not least because the pontiff himself delivered “a long discourse on the school of those who had held sinister opinions, naming Contarini, England, and Fano, and saying that he knew who still remained,” as Bernardino Pia wrote to Cesare Gonzaga that same day. [7] On 8 March he reported another consistory in which Paul IV had delivered a new and interminable discourse on “the sincerity that cardinals must maintain in the election of the pope, without regard to any dependency, and above all to take care to avoid heretics; and saying this he turned toward Sant’Angelo [Ranuccio Farnese] and Santa Fiora [Guido Ascanio Sforza] and added: ‘There have been some who, with a fury and madness we cannot comprehend, intended to give their votes to heretics.’ This seemed intended to mark those who in 1550 wished to make England pope and in 1555 Morone.” [8]

Whether a show of force or an outburst of rage, the unprecedented bull of February 1559 was clearly capable of turning every future conclave into a *jeu de massacre* and, in any event, of entrusting the choice of the pontiff forever to the Holy Office. It expressed Pope Carafa’s anxiety to bind the hands of whoever was

about to take his place on the throne of Peter, preventing him from repudiating his religious and political choices. From this perspective, the decree may legitimately be seen as a consequence of his fear that he would not succeed in concluding the trial of the Milanese cardinal as he wished; by this means he sought to strike him extrajudicially, at the very least barring his path to the tiara. It is not surprising that on 25 March a newswriter reported that "Morone's affairs go from bad to worse." [9] Reporting an illness that had struck him, on 29 March Bernardino Pia advanced the hypothesis "that it was caused by the cardinals' visit to His Most Reverend Lordship the other day, when he perhaps discovered the direction in which his affairs are going." [10] Carnesecchi was condemned in absentia on 6 April, [11] and on 27 May a report stated that the pontiff, pressed by the rapid deterioration of his physical condition, "had assigned Cardinal Morone the final deadline for his defenses." [12]

Rumors and conjectures about the possible outcome continued to vary and at times conflict, but all agreed that the affair was moving toward an imminent conclusion. "Every day the cardinals appointed to this business hold meetings," a Farnese agent reported on 19 May, drawing favorable auguries from the fact. [13] The next day, as evidence of how many observers wandered in the darkness of inquisitorial secrecy, Ascanio Celso informed Alessandro Farnese that "the prevailing opinion is to fear for his affairs, that he may lose active and passive voice." That same day Pia wrote that the cardinal commission had met no fewer than five times that week: "It is now truly believed that Our Lord wishes to bring matters to some conclusion." [14] The final prosecution witness, yet another Dominican, was heard in Rome on 31 May 1559. [15] Already on the 20th, however, Giulio Grandi had written to Ferrara that the cardinal commission in charge of the trial was pressing Morone "with harsh words, so that it is believed he will be condemned at the first consistory that is held"; meanwhile the Cardinal of Mantua asked Pia to keep him informed of developments in the trial, "whether the news you have to give me is good or bad." [16]

For Morone's friends too the time had come to act, and among them Ercole Gonzaga was the most active and energetic, always ready to press his Roman agent for fresh news. [17] On 22 June 1559 he wrote to the accused cardinal himself to assure him of his full support; two days later he urged his ambassador at the imperial court to intervene with the Cardinal of Augsburg and Ferdinand I; on the 25th he also stressed the importance of the moment to Juan Manrique and Bernardo de Fresneda, seeking to induce them to use their good offices with Philip II; on 9 July he again pressed Manrique, acting as intermediary for "a packet of letters" that Morone himself had sent him to be forwarded to the Spanish king's court. [18] Perhaps it was news from Flanders, or the echo of these courageous interventions, that led Carnesecchi in those weeks to hope that matters would "turn out well, since the Catholic King is pressing strongly for the case to be concluded." [19] On 17 July it was again Gonzaga who sent the accused cardinal "some little legal opinions" he had commissioned, together with copies of the letters recently dispatched to Brussels. [20] A month later, finally, he sought the cooperation of the Duke of Urbino, Guidubaldo II Della Rovere, in forwarding to Rome a "small packet" containing "a letter from Gheri concerning the service of the cardinal his patron." [21] In that decisive spring and summer of 1559 the Cardinal of Mantua thus assumed the role of intermediary between Morone and his Roman collaborators on the one hand and the Habsburg court on the other, where Gheri still remained. While efforts in favor of the Milanese cardinal also continued in Parma, [22] on 15 July Emperor Ferdinand signed at Augsburg precise instructions for his new ambassador in Rome, Franz von Thurm. He commended Morone's case to him, professing the greatest affection for a man who for more than two years had been confined in prison "because of the iniquity of the times." It was his express wish that Morone be swiftly released, restored to his dignity, and admitted with full rights to the conclave that now appeared imminent. Declaring himself absolutely certain of his innocence, Ferdinand ordered the ambassador to spare no effort to meet Morone and learn from his own lips "in what way he might be helped by lawful and honorable means." [23]

For some time already the tribunal had been working through the massive documentation amassed by four years of investigation. The death in Rome on 22 May of one of the cardinals assigned to the trial, Virgilio Rosario - who "was mourned by few because of his severity" [24] - slowed the work for only a few days; the pontiff's urgings caused it to resume immediately. The formal reading of a summary of the trial records

began on 2 June in the presence of the pope and the nine cardinals he had designated: Michele Ghislieri, Scipione Rebiba, and Giovanni Reumano, joined by the other members of the congregation, Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, Pedro Pacheco, Giacomo Puteo, Bernardino Scotti, Clemente Dolera, and Giovanni Michele Saraceno. [25] The work could not resume the next day, but to prevent the affair from dragging on Paul IV suspended every other activity of the supreme inquisitors and ordered them to meet daily, even on Sundays, as indeed they did. “They began to read the trial conducted against Cardinal Morone, which is very large,” a Farnese agent wrote on the 3rd, emphasizing that the pontiff had ordered the cardinals assigned to the case to come every afternoon to examine the records in his presence, because he wished “to dispatch this case, and they are pressing him very hard.” The same day another Roman correspondent informed Parma that at least two weeks would be needed to study the voluminous file. His pessimism - “I expect little good from it, given the many indications I have” - was shared by the Spanish agent Ascanio Caracciolo, who informed Philip II of the fear “that he may be brought to the final straits of deprivation, because the case is tightening remarkably”; [26] and also by the Florentine resident, according to whom “the general judgment is unfavorable,” as he wrote on the 9th, adding that “Our Lord follows this business closely in order to bring it to an end and attends to no other affairs.” “It is thought that he wishes to declare and deprive Morone,” a Roman report echoed the next day. [27]

The reading of the trial continued without interruption until 12 June, [28] and everything suggested that the Milanese cardinal “will soon come to the decisive point, and deprivation is expected at the first or second consistory,” in the opinion of the Este resident Giulio Grandi on 7 June. [29] The Mantuan agent was more optimistic, though it did not escape him that “the most holy office of the Inquisition is wholly, wholly occupied with this one affair.” Even Morone’s closest collaborators felt entitled to hope that he would soon emerge from prison “free and innocent as before, in His Beatitude’s favor, unless, as some courtiers maintain, he were given some form of canonical purgation, *saltem pro suspitione*, which they say the cardinal cannot refuse to make if it is commanded by Our Lord, his supreme prince.” [30] This was too little for Paul IV, who aimed instead at a definitive condemnation. Carnesecchi too - reporting what “a great Theatine” was said to have declared in Venice - believed that “the pope could do Morone no harm, and for this reason had begun to turn toward benignity, being unable to use the rigor he wished.” But in the judgment of Alvise Lippomano, who knew of certain specific evidence against the cardinal, it was more likely that “his punishment would be deprivation of active and passive voice, and that even his hat was in danger, especially since His Holiness holds him in ill repute because he belongs to Cardinal Pole’s school,” as Gianfigliazzi wrote to Florence. [31]

The dense interweaving of reports and denials, rumors and hypotheses, hopes and fears that had accompanied the trial from the outset grew still denser in its final months. On 10 June an anonymous Roman correspondent of Anna Morone Stampa informed her that in the previous day’s “secret congregation” the reading of the prosecution testimony had been completed and that, still in daily meetings, they were now examining the “many writings cited in the trial.” The pope had said “that he was old and infirm, but since this case concerned the service of God, he would not fail to attend as long as he was able.” For his part, “for the past eight days Cardinal Alessandrino has not failed every morning to remain secluded in his chamber with the notary of the Office and the Master of the Sacred Palace, reviewing writings concerning this business, which are then read during the day’s congregation.” The work was completed in a short time, after which they proceeded “to grant the defenses and a copy of the trial to the accused.” Three days later the surviving cardinals of the original commission - Ghislieri, Rebiba, and Reumano - went to Castel Sant’Angelo to inform Morone that he had been granted the so-called defenses, which he was to present within one month. [32] The defendant thereby acquired the right to appoint his advocates and procurators, meet with them and with his collaborators, obtain a copy of the evidence collected by the inquisitors in order to formulate his rebuttals, seek documents capable of disproving the charges, commission legal opinions to submit to the tribunal, and promote defensive inquiries by indicating the witnesses to be questioned and the questions to be put to them. The pope therefore imagined that everything could be done quickly, putting an end to the uncertainties and delays that had marked the preceding months. The discovery that issuing the sentence required far more than a few weeks seemed almost to take him by surprise and led him to show few

scruples about violating procedural rules. This is demonstrated by the fact that notification of the decree occurred before the Holy Office was able to give Morone a copy of the trial record, which the notaries were preparing in great haste.

This gave rise to an incident between the pontiff and his faithful Cardinal Alessandrino. On 19 June Pope Carafa "rose in the greatest anger against him, raising his voice so that he did not seem ill," when he learned that the three cardinals had agreed to Morone's request that the month allotted for presenting his defenses should begin only when the copy of the trial record was actually delivered to him. Furious at what seemed to him merely a waste of time, he ordered them to return to Castel Sant'Angelo and inform the prisoner that the period would instead begin on the day of the congregation's decree. It was a plainly unlawful act, to which no one had "the courage to reply a single word," although all were convinced that "it was an express injustice," and therefore felt the need to protect themselves with the formula *de mandato et commissione sanctissimi Domini*. The following day, however, with a cooler head, Paul IV himself realized that this rash gesture risked invalidating every subsequent act and reversed course - though not without summoning the supreme inquisitor to give him "a great rebuke, telling him of his lack of diligence in not having ordered the copy of Morone's trial to be prepared sooner." That same day the defense attorneys took their oath, the two leading advocates of the Roman bar, Marcantonio Borghese and Antonio Massa da Gallese. [33]

Morone's interest in delaying the formal steps as much as possible is equally clear, since the abrupt acceleration imposed on the trial revealed that Pope Carafa was now preparing to pronounce a sentence whose verdict was implicit in his anxious desire to prevent the matter from falling to his successor. It was no coincidence that precisely in this period, between June and August 1559, the most energetic efforts developed around the accused cardinal - now authorized to have free contact with the outside world - to contribute to an outcome favorable to him.

2. The Death of Paul IV

With the granting of the "defenses" decreed by the Holy Office on 12 June 1559, the defendant acquired the right to submit to the judges anything he considered useful "to prove the falsity of the indications" advanced against him. [34] The tribunal thereby complied with the rule that "no one should be condemned without being able to defend himself, since defense is a right of nature," according to Cesare Carena's *Tractatus de officio sanctissimae Inquisitionis*, [35] not least because "sometimes," "by chance," it might happen that the defendant was innocent, as Eliseo Masini would grudgingly admit in the *Sacro arsenale*. [36] Yet attention soon focused on the pope's physical collapse. He was "very discolored and in very poor condition," a Roman newswriter reported on 17 June, while also noting his stubborn refusal to eat meat on Friday, saying that he was "not a Lutheran." [37] As soon as the tribunal's decision was notified to him, however, Morone asked that the month granted him be extended, or at least calculated from the actual delivery of the copy of the trial records - on which point he presented a formal *protestatio* on the 17th - that the writings and papers seized at the time of his arrest be restored to him, that the names of the witnesses who had testified against him be revealed, and finally that he be allowed to leave Castel Sant'Angelo and return home, where he could work more comfortably. [38] Always well informed about affairs in the Vatican palaces, as early as 14 June Bernardino Pia was able to give Cesare Gonzaga a detailed account of what had happened the previous day, when the inquisitors notified Morone that he had been granted a defense: "In the meantime they have enlarged His Most Reverend Lordship's liberty and ordered that he may speak with whomever he wishes and with those who come to visit him, and already at every hour many people flock to him." [39]

As for the request that the one-month period granted to him should at least begin with the actual delivery of the trial records, which he had still not received, [40] only on the 20th - as we have seen - did the cardinal commission manage to persuade the pope to respect the rules, compelling him *obtorto collo* to accept Morone's request. [41] The grave illness of the old pontiff, who was also trying to bring other trials to completion, such as those against Foscarari and Sanfelice, [42] announced his imminent end and set political and personal maneuvering for the conclave in motion, while the defensive phase had yet to begin. The

ceremony in which the defense team took its oath was held on 20 June, [43] but only on 7 July could the copy of the trial records be delivered to Morone, who on that occasion presented another formal protest over the mutilations and censures with which it was riddled. The tribunal needed three more days to provide him with transcripts of the minutes of his own interrogations. [44] With these formalities the "month allowed for making his defenses" began, [45] and thus opened the delicate defensive phase of the trial: the phase in which Morone could finally play more than a merely passive role in the dramatic affair of which he was the protagonist, resume contacts with the outside world, learn the substance of the accusations and demonstrate their groundlessness, and submit to the tribunal documents and legal memoranda capable of disproving the charges. Among the first to see him again after two years of imprisonment were his auditor, Girolamo Parisetto, and an anonymous correspondent of his sister Anna, who immediately informed her of events, reporting among other things that the cardinal was well and had "a very good countenance," but that his hair had turned entirely white. [46]

Once in possession of a copy of the trial records, Morone and his advocates could organize their defensive strategy in concrete terms. On 13 July the *supremus inquisitor* Michele Ghislieri returned to Parisetto the books and manuscripts seized at the time of the arrest and recorded in a special *Inventarium* listing seventy-two items. [47] But a few days later the accused cardinal had another document submitted to the tribunal, an *Inventory of the Writings Requested from the Most Reverend Lords Appointed by the Most Reverend Cardinal Morone that Bear on the Case*, of which the autograph draft survives. [48] It listed further books, manuscripts, letters, memorials, and trial papers - more than 150 documents in all - which he asked to have at his disposal and which were largely provided to him by the end of the month. [49] On 17 July, meanwhile, after having "given that trial a quick reading," Ercole Gonzaga declared himself optimistic, [50] undoubtedly also because in Rome everyone now considered "the pope finished." [51] On 20 July Marcantonio Borghese was received in the congregation of the Holy Office in the pope's presence, and the pontiff "showed him many favors," while Morone's other advocate, Antonio Massa, was busy studying the papers. "Today he told me that his affairs will turn out very well: God grant it," Marchio Valeri wrote to Alessandro Farnese on the 22nd. [52] In Milan, Anna Morone Stampa and her collaborators were extremely active in helping to gather the documentation for the defense and expressed confidence in a positive outcome. "By God's grace the cardinal is well, and the advocates are having the writings reviewed, and there is good hope in every respect," she wrote to Giovan Francesco Stella on 24 July 1559, assuring him that she would have "the copies you ask of me" transcribed and, "if I have the opportunity of a trustworthy messenger, will send everything by a special person." [53] On 9 August one of Morone's friends and collaborators, Alessandro Olocati, was able to read "the trial concerning the charges made against Your Most Reverend Lordship." He declared himself scandalized by the absurdity of those accusations and ready to "testify, depose, and prove" on Morone's behalf. [54]

Today little can be reconstructed of this network of contacts and outside assistance, or of the feverish work carried out by Morone and his collaborators, [55] while the inquisitors continued to display uncompromising rigor and the pontiff, conscious of the few days of life remaining to him, lost no opportunity to insist upon a swift conclusion. On 28 July 1559 Bernardino Pia informed Cardinal Gonzaga of the situation, recounting a conversation with Morone during which he had discreetly handed him the documents received from Mantua: [56]

> His Most Reverend Lordship clearly understands that if the pope were to die before his case was concluded, he could enter the conclave; His Holiness and the cardinal judges know the same, and for this reason the pope is pressing the conclusion with great haste, while burdens are being placed upon him, including this one: they have not restored the writings taken from him at the beginning that are relevant to his case, so that the day before yesterday he was forced to make a protest that the time should not run until those writings had been wholly returned. His Most Reverend Lordship knows very well that it would be good for the case to drag on, and he himself will not hasten it, but he finds so much passion in the pope and in the judges that he does not know how he can delay the course they are giving it. He says that four days ago the pope thundered mightily about his case, saying there was no need for so many trials, writings, or justifications, nor to observe procedures; that he knew perfectly well how the matter stood; that he was the true judge and could and ought to pronounce sentence without anything further, and other similar and

> terrible words. Yet he hopes in God that the cardinals will not allow him to be wronged, especially Pacheco and Puteo, who have the trial in their hands, and Pacheco is having it copied so that he may keep a copy with him and examine it at all hours. If no wrong is done him, His Most Reverend Lordship is certain of fully justifying himself. Carpi has sent to excuse and offer himself, and has promised to remain as withdrawn as he can; but Morone does not believe him or trust him greatly.

The information Ascanio Caracciolo sent to the court of the Catholic King was less alarming but not very different. Among other things, he reported that the tribunal had granted the accused cardinal a further extension, thereby accepting his request. One must also bear in mind that the full inquisitorial congregation, to which the pontiff had entrusted the task of issuing the sentence, was far from unanimous. This is suggested by what a Roman correspondent of Ottavio Farnese reported on 29 July concerning Cardinal Pacheco's intention to study the trial papers "at leisure and maturely," since it was a matter of the highest importance. He concluded that "from these words it is conjectured that Morone's affairs will turn out well, and they already say that no fewer than four months will be needed to conclude them." [57] The cautious optimism suggested here, which Carnesecchi in Venice also shared, [58] arose from the fact that it was now clear that Morone's fate depended above all on the rapid decline of the decrepit Neapolitan pontiff's health. Paul IV's personal animosity toward the Milanese cardinal had been too evident from the outset, as had the overbearing severity with which he directed the Inquisition and his desire to accelerate the final sentence as much as possible, for his disappearance not to change the very terms of the issue radically and direct Morone's trial toward outcomes less bleak than many had predicted.

Already in September 1558 the rumor had spread that the pope had suffered an apoplectic stroke and had "entirely lost his mind, in such a way that he commits the most hideous and astonishing follies." [59] On 8 March of the following year Cosimo de' Medici was informed from Venice that the government of the Serenissima would have wished to see in His Holiness "a little less rigor and much greater consideration for the nature of the times in which this little of Christendom that remains to us finds itself; and many are accustomed to say that His Beatitude seeks to make it known that his sword no longer cuts and is little better than wood." [60] At times so weak that he could not stand, yet always ready for fits of anger, a few weeks before his death Paul IV had an imposing marble statue of himself set up in the Palace of the Conservators - destined, as we shall see, to a short life. Its unveiling was reported to Cardinal Ranuccio Farnese in a sarcastic letter from Tommaso Cavalieri dated 26 June 1559, documenting the pontiff's growing unpopularity and almost foreshadowing the events that would shortly accompany his death: [61]

> The pope's statue has finally been uncovered, after having been wrapped for many days in a bedcover; and I think this happened because, as it is an invention of the conservator to cook fish heads wrapped in a napkin so that none of the goodness escapes, he kept it so that the divinity would not drip out. A guard has been kept there day and night lest anyone, from the great desire there is to see it, should do it some harm in trying to uncover it. [...] Compared with this one, the statue of Nebuchadnezzar was a beast, because although at its unveiling there were lyres, symphonies, sackbuts, pipes, and *omnis generis musicarum*, at this one there have additionally been bells, artillery, and fireworks, though it deserved many more than were provided. And if Nebuchadnezzar's had to be adored by public edict, that is unnecessary for this one, because the goodwill is so great that everyone longs to see it fly all the way to heaven. [...] I have not only prostrated myself on the ground, but gone down beneath the cellar so as to have it above my head, and I wish I could have a piece of it to preserve as a relic. Otherwise, things here are going so well that we have more than enough; we have so much grain that we must throw it into the river, and justice is done summarily, with no need for Bartolus or Baldus. [...] I shall have wearied Your Most Illustrious Lordship by writing at such length; yet I beg you to have compassion on those who live amid such delights as we do, for it is almost impossible to hear and see such beautiful things without sharing them with one's patrons.

The "joy" of the ceremony, as was written to Cardinal Madruzzo, arose solely from "the expectation of Our Lord's death," [62] an expectation undoubtedly among the first to be entertained by Philip II. Still in Ghent but now preparing to return to Spain, he was kept constantly informed of developments in the trial by Ascanio Caracciolo and Cardinal Pacheco. [63] Conscious of the importance his intervention might have, at the beginning of August the Catholic King wrote to his ambassador in Rome, Don Juan de Figueroa - whom the pope had finally resolved to receive after subjecting him too to grave accusations - inviting him to use his good offices so that the Milanese cardinal might at last be cleared of every charge. [64] In the same packet the

king also sent six letters without named recipients but addressed to six different cardinals, whom the ambassador was to identify on the basis of his direct knowledge of attitudes in the Curia, urging them to intervene in favor of their accused colleague. Figueroa died at the end of July and therefore did not receive these letters; Caracciolo did, and was able to use them in the crucial days following the pontiff's death on 18 August. [65] The letters were probably carried to Italy by Filippo Gheri, Morone's most trusted collaborator, whom the cardinal had sent between the end of 1558 and the beginning of 1559 to plead his cause at the court of the Catholic King. [66] Gheri departed from there at the beginning of August, reached Augsburg on the 13th, and immediately hastened onward to Rome. [67]

There the pope's death was expected from day to day. With the conclave in view, on 8 August the English ambassador in France, Nicholas Throckmorton, informed Queen Elizabeth that Morone would be among the four men considered likely to be elected, together with Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, Guido Ascanio Sforza, and Ippolito d'Este. [68] The hypothesis was improbable in the extreme, yet it went hand in hand with the conviction that the end of the Carafa reign would close an ugly parenthesis and that the disastrous season of temporal and spiritual wars might be forgotten. On 18 August 1559 itself, for example, when news arrived that Paul IV had entered his final agony, the Florentine ambassador Giovan Battista Ricasoli wrote to the duke that "Morone will come out once His Holiness has closed his eyes." [69] In reality things did not happen quite so simply, proof of the profound fractures that the dying pontiff and the Holy Office had marked in the history of those years. The cardinal had to wait another two days before emerging from the prison in which he had been confined for twenty-seven months, with "the wound of imprisonment" still "too fresh" for anyone to dare visit him. [70]

A spectacular signal of the political turn under way was the iconoclastic fury with which the Roman people fell upon the pontiff's insignia, the Carafa palaces and coats of arms, Ripetta prison, and the Dominican convent of the Minerva, freeing prisoners and setting the inquisitorial archives ablaze while cursing the crimes of the newly dead pope's rapacious relatives. Having ascended the throne as the man capable of reforming the Church and inaugurating a new age of morality and justice, [71] less than four years later Pope Carafa was surrounded by a "ruined" court, where "not a single business in the world is dispatched, so that everyone wastes away and consumes himself with vain hopes." Moreover, the pope showed signs of despair after reading "a list of more than 1,300 very outrageous sentences caused to be issued by his nephews, saying that they wished to make him die and go to hell; therefore" - it was written in January 1559 - "he went to Saint Peter's to pray, visiting the seven altars not without tears." [72] A convinced supporter of Paul IV, Massarelli recorded with bitter desolation the death of that "most holy and truly Catholic, pious, excellent supreme pontiff," mourning the Church left without such a shepherd. Hence his indignation at the assault on Ripetta prison, an act "wicked, abominable, impious, criminal, unspeakable, to be cursed forever," the like of which had never occurred in living memory in the *sedes apostolorum*. [73] Its effects were felt outside Rome as well, for example in the kingdom of Naples, where the heterodox who gathered around Giovan Francesco Alois 74 - as he would relate in an interrogation of 1564 - believed the time had come to cast off the mask and profess their faith: "While Pope Paul IV lived we were very restrained in speaking of these matters, but after the burning of Ripetta was heard of and that he was dead, we who held these opinions loosened our hands and spoke fully of these Lutheran opinions." [75]

The ambassadors in Rome hastened to report that all the inhabitants were "under arms" and the prisons in flames, "a truly frightening thing"; that the rioters "joyfully carry the prohibited books through the city"; that the archives of the Holy Office had been plundered and destroyed; that some of the tribunal's officials had been beaten and wounded; that notorious heretics roamed the streets "with cheerful faces" accompanied by armed friends; and that the Dominicans of the Minerva had been driven out by popular fury amid "infinite jubilation and joy" and cries of "the house of Carafa to the devil!" [76] "The Holy Inquisition has died the same death by which it was accustomed to make others die, namely by fire; and certainly it has been a most remarkable occurrence, from which it seems one may judge that the divine clemency does not wish that office henceforth to be exercised with as much austerity and rigor as in the past," Carnesecchi exulted on 2 September. [77] "It was almost as though there had been a sack," commented the Florentine resident, who

throughout the day had watched people laden with plunder pass beneath his house. [78] Among the many sources that make it possible to reconstruct those spectacular events, the diary of Cola Coleine, an eyewitness, is especially vivid: [79]

> Having learned early on the morning of the 18th of the gravity of His Beatitude's illness, and after saying infinite evils of the pope, the Romans resolved to break open all the prisons, especially Ripetta, which was the prison of the Inquisition. [...] After dinner, without waiting for the pope to expire, the district leaders went *armata manu* with great uproar to Ripetta, and not only freed the prisoners but robbed and sacked the house; with the same fury they went to the Minerva, where they had heard there was another prison of heretics, and wished to burn the monastery and throw the friars from the windows.

Further details emerge from the notes added by Vincenzo Belo, a devotee of Pope Carafa who was likewise convinced that "all the evil" had been caused by his wretched nephews. Only the intervention of Giuliano Cesarini in the name of the city's supreme magistracy succeeded in calming the enraged crowd that had rushed to the Minerva. [80] No fewer than forty-two "heresiarchs, enemies of God" were enabled to flee Ripetta - "bishops, friars, priests, and laymen" - on the sole promise that they would henceforth be "good Christians and obedient to the Apostolic See." [81] Everything was devastated and stolen: "wine, wheat and other grain, money and goods, countless books," many of which were immediately burned by the rebellious populace, joined without hesitation by some "gentlemen." [82] The house of the inquisitorial notary Claudio de Valle 83 was stormed: "Had they found him they would have treated him badly; they took all his papers and burned them." [84] Others targeted Cardinal Alfonso Carafa's palace at San Macuto, which too was invaded and plundered, as were a nearby convent of nuns and the vineyard at Montecavallo. After entering the Capitol, the most excited among them defaced the statue of the pope in the second hall of the Conservators and "cut off one arm - the one with which he gave the blessing - as well as the nose and ears, and ruined the whole thing with a halberd." [85] The following day, [19] August, pressed by the protest, the city government resolved to have all symbols of the Carafa pontificate "erased, broken, and torn down" - coats of arms, inscriptions, paintings, statues - "to annihilate the tyrant and the name hated by the Roman people." In that fury the men who again took to the streets needed no urging to execute the decree. [86] "O tempora, o mores," Massarelli lamented, furious at the public legitimation of so many crimes, the inaction of the Sacred College, and the evident satisfaction of many. [87]

Nor was it yet over. The scarcity of monuments to his own greatness that Paul IV had left behind offered few opportunities for popular rage to vent itself, and the crowd therefore returned to maltreat the statue newly erected on the Capitol, [88] already defaced the previous day and now again thrown down and shattered. The head wearing the triple crown was cast from a window of the Palace of the Conservators and abandoned to the tumultuous crowd, which dragged it "ignominiously" through all the streets and squares of Rome, while "boys and rogues inflicted the greatest outrages upon it." [89] The pontiff's hieratic face was smeared with mud and excrement and left to the children, who "spat on it and mocked it as one commonly mocks Master Pasquino, who would have been treated with greater respect." [90] At one point the yellow cap of the Jews was placed on the tiara and "boys and others shouted: Jewish pope, Jewish pope," an evident retaliation for the severe discriminatory rules he had decreed. Likewise, to evoke his inquisitorial intransigence, bundles of wood were gathered in Campo de' Fiori on which to burn what remained of the solemn marble image. [91] The macabre celebration lasted four days, until someone resolved to give "two giulii to a pair of men to carry it away and throw it into the river," [92] where it would be accidentally rediscovered at the end of the nineteenth century. As Niccolò Franco would say ten years later, it was not merely a few troublemakers who inflicted those insults upon the pontiff's statue, but "an entire people." [93] The canons of Saint Peter's themselves made the bronze bust of the Neapolitan pope disappear, though only a few months earlier they had had it installed in the sacristy; and when the corpse - initially hidden in the Sistine Chapel to prevent similar mutilation 94 - was transferred under armed guard to the Vatican basilica, they waited until Pope Carafa's nephews and creatures had withdrawn "to show their share of hatred" by leaving it unattended, without lighted candles and without even a ring on its finger. [95] In the days that followed the waters calmed and the social and political hierarchies were restored. The Conservators attempted to explain what had happened to the Sacred College by recalling "how this tyrannical house has waged war on us for so many

years through no fault of ours, tyrannizing us with so many taxes, ruin, persecutions, imprisonments, famine, and cruelty," Belo reported, [96] aware that such justifications would receive a sympathetic hearing from some. On 23 August the novendials could begin, concluding on 2 September with the obsequies conducted *ut moris est*, according to Massarelli, [97] though in reality on a reduced scale so as not to provide an occasion for further disturbances. The funeral oration, whose brevity betrays the persistence of tension, was delivered by the humanist from Frosinone Giovanni Paolo Flavio. He celebrated the nobility of the Carafa family, the great prelates who had distinguished it, the pontiff's many virtues, his vast learning, the foundation of the Theatines, the dignities conferred on him by his predecessors, his constant desire for peace, and finally the reforms enacted during his brief reign, insisting that until his death he had devoted himself body and soul either to bringing heretics back into the Catholic fold or to destroying them, "so that they might not contaminate others with their poisonous doctrines." [98] Yet not even a passing reference to Paul IV appeared in the oration *De summo pontifice eligendo ad cardinales* delivered by Giulio Poggiano on the eve of the conclave. In it he urged the cardinals to choose a pope "the servant of divine goodness and not of his own greed, the promoter of your liberty and of the public good, not of the desires of others," sketching the ideal profile of the supreme helmsman the Church needed in order to escape the reefs and storms that threatened it. [99]

To those whose opinions differed from Catholic orthodoxy, news of those dramatic events seemed to announce the end of a season of anxiety and persecution. At the beginning of September, for example, the Marquis of Arena, Giovan Francesco Concublet, a Neapolitan convert to Valdesian doctrines and a relative of Mario Galeota, wrote of them to a friend, the *iuris utriusque doctor* Bernardino Bernardini, probably also a companion in faith destined to have trouble with the Holy Office, if the letter is now preserved in inquisitorial archives. With him Concublet had no fear of rejoicing at what had happened in Rome, where Morone had been "freed by common consent of the college of the most reverend lords after having been imprisoned on the advice of three or four counterfeit friars," and the Inquisition had been "driven out," its prisons attacked and its books burned. All this encouraged the hope that things would change in Naples as well, that the time was over for "all those sweeping bows down to the ground made to the Dominican friars and all those submissions and full purses," and for those "poor books banished without being able to present their reasons, since by God's grace the 'thus I will, thus I command' and what follows 100 has now been extinguished; and the most stubborn ignorance of wicked and dissembling friars will no longer be preferred to apostolic authority, because the good brotherhood is that which exists among true Christians." Certainly, the "vile acts against the person of the pontiff's body" perpetrated by the tumultuous populace were deplorable, "but such is the divine goodness that it always draws good from evil," he concluded, hoping that the next pontiff would be "a charitable shepherd." [101]

3. The Election of Pius IV

The legacy left by the collapse of the Carafa pontificate was therefore extremely heavy. To the failure of its ambitious political designs, the disastrous outcome of the anti-Spanish war, and the hatred of the Romans was added the temporary defeat of its inquisitorial strategy: dozens of heretics freed by popular fury, the precious archives of the Holy Office destroyed forever, and the narrow liberation of Morone, which implied an open repudiation of the bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* 102 and allowed a cardinal accused of heresy to participate in the choice of the new vicar of Christ. There was also the crumbling of the image of austere reformer with which Paul IV had always wished to identify himself, because of the discredit brought upon him by his nephews through their "many, most evil, and accursed deeds." They were now exposed not only to the pope's indignation but to the vengeance of their enemies, who would overwhelm them. [103] Already on 30 August all the Carafa, except the two cardinals Carlo and Alfonso, were deprived of Roman citizenship, while Marcantonio Colonna and Giovan Francesco Bagno laid claim to the fiefs of Paliano and Montebello, which Paul IV had taken from them for the benefit of Giovanni and Antonio Carafa. [104]

After the many upheavals and lacerations of that turbulent pontificate, in short, a change of course was expected and desired by everyone except the loyalists entrenched in the Holy Office under Michele Ghislieri.

Pasquino wished for him “that the blessed hand | may kiss that great fire of Ripetta,” while hoping that Pope Carafa lay “among the dead | in eternal torment and storm, | as on the Capitol without his head.” [105] It mattered little who the next pope would be, “whether Turk or Marrano, since now it costs the same, | whether wolf or fox intent on fresh prey, | or even a muleteer born of incest,” a traitor, thief, or hardened sinner, provided that “for pity’s sake he not be any sort of Theatine!” [106] Within the span of a few days everything had changed in Rome, where a political and religious turn favorable to Morone was taking shape. Yet he too became a target of the pasquinades: some feared his possible revenge - “I know he will avenge the wrong done him, | and you would see the Church brought to a sad harbor” - while others insinuated that Pope Carafa’s accusations had not been groundless - “he erred, and greatly, in releasing him, | for the accursed worm still gnaws at him.” [107]

Besides the restoration of public order, the burning question of whether the Milanese cardinal could enter the conclave was the first the Sacred College had to face. “His freedom is regarded as certain, but there is doubt whether he can cast a vote or receive one from the others, since judgment has not yet been given in his case,” Ottavio Farnese was informed on 19 August. [108] The meeting held by the Sacred College that day was fruitless, and only on the 21st did it find a way to resolve the issue. Yet this occurred after a bitter debate, testimony to how strong the resistance of the inquisitors still was, though they were forced to lick the wounds inflicted by the fire at Ripetta. [109] For his part, between 18 and 21 August the Milanese cardinal was ready to present two opinions by his advocates, Marcantonio Borghese and Antonio Massa, undoubtedly drafted in the preceding weeks, which supported with an extensive apparatus of legal authorities his right to be admitted to the conclave with both active and passive vote. [110] Thus on 22 August Gianfigliazzi reported to the Duke of Florence on that delicate meeting of the Sacred College: [111]

> I have been informed by someone who knows that there were many disputes and confusion almost arose, and they divided among themselves, because the camerlengo [Guido Ascanio Sforza of Santa Fiora] wished him to be - as he was - wholly free, while others wished that he should not be able to take part until his trial was concluded. Carpi showed himself in Morone’s favor in this, as did others to the number of about fifteen, out of twenty-five in all. But above all the opposing cardinals was Puteo, who would not yield and always contradicted, though he knew that the camerlengo favored him and had made it his cause; he wished Morone to have no voice in conclave, saying it was enough if he could remain in his own house and that this should satisfy him, adding that he ought first to make a certain confession. Other Theatines and men with crooked necks followed this example; Pisa [Scipione Rebiba] openly declared himself against him and showed himself Morone’s bitterest enemy; Pacheco too adhered to Puteo’s opinion against Morone. In the end, whether because they feared some scandal might arise, there were enough votes to free him, and they immediately sent for him and he entered the congregation.

According to some, “of twenty-five votes he had thirteen in favor and twelve against,” and according to others “he obtained his liberation by only two votes more.” [112] It was a narrow and contested majority, yet at the same time irrevocable because immediately effective. In accordance with that decision, on 21 August Cardinals Francesco Pisani, Robert de Lénoncourt, and Guido Ascanio Sforza of Santa Fiora, representing the three orders, went to Castel Sant’Angelo to communicate the news to Morone and escort him back to his place in the Sacred College, where “he was received and embraced by all with the greatest joy and as a good, upright, and innocent man.” In this way he recovered *in toto* the dignity of his rank, “it having pleased the goodness of our Lord God to cause him to be freed and absolved without the aid of his articles and defenses,” it was written at the time to Mantua, “and God grant that he who has been judged may not judge others in the future.” Informing the Duke of Urbino of the narrow majority by which Morone had been freed, on 21 August an agent reported that while the cardinal was “received by all and embraced by each,” some common people had taken pleasure in running through the Borgo shouting, “Here is the pope!” [113] A large following accompanied him back to his residence, while celebrating children cried “Long live Morone!” [114] That same day Ascanio Caracciolo also wrote to Philip II, telling him that “Your Majesty’s recommendations [...] have been a most powerful cause.” [115]

Having regained his liberty - together with Foscarari and Sanfelice 116 - Morone’s first act was to communicate the news to his sister in Milan, while letters of congratulation arrived from every quarter at his palace in Trastevere, visited by throngs of friends, prelates, and ambassadors. Some even went so far as to

speculate that within a few days he might be elected to the papal throne, as Carnesecchi too allowed himself to hope. [117] Others more wisely regarded it as already a great achievement "that he is in the college, wholly restored to his former state." [118] For once Master Pasquino took the side of the grim inquisitors, proclaiming that despite his "pretenses" the Milanese cardinal was a "great vessel of heresy," [119] deserved "the fire," and that making him pope would therefore "introduce scandal into the faith." [120] Finally, on 5 September, while the news spread throughout Europe, Morone entered the conclave together with the faithful Filippo Gheri, who was rewarded with several good ecclesiastical pensions for the precious services he had rendered during the trial. [121]

Obtained above all through pressure from the Spanish court and the explicit support of Emperor Ferdinand I, Cosimo de' Medici, Ercole Gonzaga, Guido Ascanio Sforza, and other authoritative cardinals, entry into the conclave was undoubtedly a success for Morone, but a hard-won one, testimony to the political and religious lacerations dividing the Sacred College. At the same time, however, it was of vital importance. By virtue of that contested decision he obtained not only his freedom - on which his colleagues were substantially agreed - but above all the right to vote in conclave, [122] which sanctioned not merely his full reinstatement but in practice his innocence of every stain of heresy, since it was unthinkable that Paul IV's successor could be elected by the vote of a heretic. At that point his absolution became only a formal matter.

As a Roman report of 26 August stated, "the most reverend cardinals said that they had released him as persecuted and not convicted, and therefore he has been fully restored with active and passive voice." [123] Everything nevertheless remained uncertain and precarious. "I do not know what to say of Morone, since the wound of his imprisonment is so fresh; yet it is much that he is in the college," reads another report of 2 September. [124] The matter passed to the conclave, a "confused and intricate labyrinth" [125] in which, as always, a play of conflicts, alliances, and outside influences would become intertwined, and the burning Morone affair could not remain extraneous. A news sheet of the 16th reported that, having found the evidence against Morone in the trial papers to be of "no value or importance," the cardinals had "once again absolved him and granted active and passive voice in this conclave by definitive sentence, so that he cannot be troubled by any future pope over past matters." This point was said even to have been sanctioned in the electoral capitulations. Rodolfo Pio da Carpi rose against Cardinal Vitelli, the only one to declare himself opposed, and with a good dose of opportunism in view of the papal election - "he is crafty and duplicitous; God knows whether it came from his heart" - answered him bluntly: "Monsignor, if you studied him yesterday, I studied him thirty years ago, for I know what a good man Morone is and that he did not deserve to be treated as he has been." Shortly afterward Ercole Gonzaga too rebuked Vitelli privately, telling him that "he could be forgiven as a young man, but it was now time he learned how to speak." [126]

It was also around the embarrassing legacy of that trial, then, that political alignments took shape, support was sought, and the electoral strategies of the cardinals were expressed or concealed. The Roman newswriter did not miss the Cardinal of Carpi's volte-face in proclaiming himself Morone's great friend. Still less did it escape the Milanese cardinal, who a week later, on 23 September, displayed his political sagacity with a skillful move that further strengthened his recovery of the rank due to him and supplied an additional sanction of his religious orthodoxy:

> Cardinal Morone, reads another Roman report, [127] made a remarkable move last Sunday. He asked Cardinal du Bellay, the dean, to summon the congregation at his request, and when they were assembled he said that he owed much to the college for the good offices many of them had performed for him in consistory with the late pope, as he did also to other princes for their good offices; and that his obligation to their most reverend lordships was all the greater because, after he had newly entered the conclave, they had annulled every injury and calumny raised against him. Nevertheless, since he understood that some cardinals, moved by envy or ignorance, said that active and passive voice had been restored to him contrary to reason, and since he did not wish to do anything by which it might be imagined that any cardinal could feel displeasure, he requested that they allow him to leave the conclave. Du Bellay replied in the name of the college that the cardinals did not in the least repent the offices performed for him and that in no way would they consent to his leaving the conclave. When he continued to insist on leaving, the greater part of the cardinals rose and begged him to be content with what the college commanded him, and so he

acquiesced. This affair has given him not only great reputation but has enabled him to recognize more clearly who his true friends are.

Certainly Morone had every interest in seeing his absolution finally decreed "by justice and not otherwise," as his sister had written from Milan to Stella on 25 August. [128] Yet the episode brings to light all the unresolved tensions still knotted around that affair, while new weapons were being sharpened in the inquisitorial chambers of distant Valladolid. There, on 6 October, the Franciscan Bernardo de Fresneda, Philip II's confessor, testified against Bartolomé Carranza, recalling among other things that in Brussels he had seen the trial dossiers of Pole and Morone, in which "with a very large number of witnesses both stood condemned as heretics." [129]

If this was the climate beginning to be felt in Spain, it is not surprising that on 3 October the ambassador in Rome, Francisco Vargas, when informing the Catholic King of Morone's admission to the conclave with active and passive vote, specified that "no one speaks of him because of what happened"; "he is not in this dance," he insisted on 12 December. [130] According to Gualteruzzi, by contrast, Morone too had cards to play, "and some say there is a prophecy that reads: 'Brought forth from prison,' adding the example of Leo X, who within a few days was freed from prison and made pope." [131] Some Roman newswriters were of a similar opinion, believing that the bitter rivalries within the Sacred College would give the Milanese cardinal some chance. "Morone, among many, notwithstanding the accusation that caused his imprisonment, has risen again and for the past four days has enjoyed the greatest expectation and credit," it was written to Mantua on 21 October, reporting the view of the "many" now convinced "that blessed God has caused this great discord among them so that, despite themselves, they will have to elect this holy man Morone." At the beginning of November it was said that he had now reached twenty votes and was therefore only a step from the tiara. [132]

As was foreseeable, the substantial Carafa party had to reckon with Habsburg hostility, despite Carlo Carafa's strenuous efforts to achieve a *ralliement* with Spain, [133] but also with the aversion of a large part of the Sacred College, often humiliated by Paul IV's overbearing conduct and at times by his open contempt. He had, for example, deprived Cardinal Camerlengo Guido Ascanio Sforza of Santa Fiora of his office in order to confer it on Alfonso Carafa. The pope's death forced the latter to return it to Paul III's nephew, who celebrated the event by having a medal struck with the inscription *Roma resurgens*. [134] Weak though it was, the group of cardinals created by Paul IV was nevertheless decisive because of the continuing conflict between the pro-French and pro-Spanish factions. The interminable duration of the conclave itself offered glaring proof of the political and religious conflicts at the summit of the Church, in a tangle of divergent political lines, personal ambitions and rivalries, candidacies burned one after another, mutual vetoes, agreements reached and immediately repudiated, and heavy outside interference. [135] So much so that the Venetian ambassador Alvise Mocenigo, unable to conceal his anti-curial sentiments, declared that this "not very sacred or holy college of cardinals is wholly ruled and governed [...] by the will of princes and the private interest of the cardinals." [136]

The reports sent in those months to the Brescian count Brunoro Gambara offer vivid accounts of the rumors then circulating in Rome, where from the outset "the common judgment is that they will remain a long while before agreeing, because there is more many-headed discord in there than among friars," his informant wrote on 16 September. In the weeks that followed he insisted that the secrecy of the papal election was violated to the point that "day by day couriers entered and left with their saddlebags full of letters." He declared himself "scandalized" and "confounded by the lack of religion of these cardinals," so immersed in their "human passions [...] that the Holy Spirit must remain far away from them." [137] On 21 October Andrea Monteceneri informed Annibale Campeggi in Bologna that "the most reverend cardinals attend to enjoying themselves as usual and stand openly at the windows, speaking with anyone they find convenient; and the dove does not appear," [138] almost confirming what Fabio Barignani had written to the Duke of Urbino as early as 6 September, hoping that "the dove and not the raven" would emerge from that "Noah's ark." [139] "If these priests were afflicted by the thousandth part of the cancers the people send upon them," it was written from Rome to Piacenza on 18 November, "they would not be able to remain standing, even if made of steel, without being reduced to ashes in two hours." [140]

The Sacred College was divided into three factions of roughly comparable size: the pro-Spanish, the pro-French, and the Carafa faction, which brought together many of Paul IV's cardinals and shifted between France and Spain to block every candidacy it regarded as hostile. Alessandro Farnese too associated himself with it, eager as always to serve as the balance in the choice of the new pontiff. The recent succession of Francis II of Valois, the crisis of monarchical authority, and the eruption of internal religious conflicts made France much weaker than in the past, while the division of the Habsburg dominions broke up the imperial party and changed the rules of the game at least in part. It is therefore not surprising that under these conditions, further complicated by the perennial internal conflicts of the Spanish group, the conclave dragged on for months amid growing indignation at the scant respect shown for canonical rules and the multiple forms of external interference, beginning with the intrusive ambassador Francisco Vargas, determined by every means to end the election of cardinals of the opposing party that had continued since Paul III's death. One after another the candidacies of Carpi, Este, Pacheco, and Gonzaga - the last supported by Morone 141 - were consumed, until a possible compromise emerged around the Milanese Gian Angelo de' Medici, elected on Christmas Day 1559 under the name Pius IV. It is worth noting that among the "articles" signed by the entire Sacred College during the conclave was a pledge not to try any of its members except in cases of high treason, schism, and heresy, which were nevertheless to be submitted by secret ballot to a cardinal commission, thereby marginalizing the Holy Office. [142]

Then sixty years old, of a "choleric and sanguine" nature, [143] a figure of no outstanding prestige and a moral profile that was not entirely impeccable, often distracted by frivolous occupations, [144] the new pontiff had been one of the last cardinals appointed by Paul III in 1549. Descended from a Milanese family very close to Morone's, as we have seen, [145] he was deeply attached to Cosimo de' Medici, the true power behind that conclave, [146] who on the occasion of his admission to the Sacred College, and by virtue of their common family name, had granted him the right to bear the Medici arms. [147] Cosimo had then entrusted command of the military operations in the war of Siena to the cardinal's brother Gian Giacomo, Marquis of Marignano, commander of the imperial army in Italy and architect of the family's fortunes, who married an Orsini, sister-in-law of Pier Luigi Farnese. [148] "Quite poor" [149] and of no especially illustrious social origin - the surname derived from the profession practiced by his ancestors - Gian Angelo had been able to study at Pavia thanks to Morone's father and had begun his ecclesiastical career under the protection of Paul III's pontificate. A diligent executor of the many governmental offices entrusted to him in the past, the newly elected pontiff had never distinguished himself by particular reforming zeal. His friendship with the Duke of Florence and his closeness to the pro-Habsburg party 150 nevertheless made him a moderate, though during the conclave he had been forced to defend himself against the charge of having told Cardinal Truchsess that some concession to Protestant demands concerning clerical marriage and use of the chalice by the laity would be opportune. [151]

On the day after the election, [30] December 1559, Gualteruzzi informed Beccadelli that "Monsignor Morone too was very favorable to him, and it is believed that he will be able to dispose of much, and thus will be able to help himself and his case." [152] His good relations with Pope Medici were well known and went back not only to their common homeland but also to the shared political choices of their families in the years before the Sack of 1527. Already at the beginning of 1560, according to Mocenigo, the Milanese cardinal enjoyed "great reputation and credit with the present pontiff," who said that he "regarded him as an angel from paradise" and used him "for counsel in all his important affairs." [153] "I understand that Morone is greatly favored by the pope, and this is no surprise to me, since - besides the kinship - there has always been great friendship between them," Carnesecchi wrote to Giulia Gonzaga in January 1560, now on the point of coming to Rome to follow events at close range, despite still being in every respect a heretic condemned in absentia. Shortly afterward he reported the widespread conviction that the pope intended to entrust Morone with "the helm": "Everyone promises himself well of this pontificate, the pope showing himself just and benign and above all inclined to quiet and peace." [154] For this reason too Cardinal de' Medici's relations with Paul IV had been far from good, which contributed in some measure to his election. The disagreements with Morone that occurred in the spring of 1561 because of Pius IV's suspicions about the cardinal's ties to his little-loved brother Gian Giacomo would prove transitory, though at times quite sharp - assuming they were not merely malicious curial gossip. [155]

The coronation ceremony took place on Epiphany, in driving rain, in the square before the Vatican basilica, which was so crowded that the pope had difficulty entering. It was marred by the deaths of many people in the crush caused by the customary throwing of coins from the loggia. [156] In the report read in Venice in 1560, Mocenigo presented the new pope as a man "affable, gentle, and benign toward everyone," so much so that he appeared "the opposite of the other." [157] Pietro Gelido, however, lamented that the cardinals had "left aside the good one, namely Cardinal Morone, and made the bad one, namely Pius IV," [158] whom Pasquino in Rome branded "a little madman, | without any reason, without a brain." [159] The Venetian ambassador's acute eye did not miss the pope's dependence on Cosimo de' Medici or "the many relatives he has, whom it is evident he wishes without delay to benefit as much as he can," making them "rich and great," [160] while also weaving marriage ties with the Della Rovere and Gonzaga. "So many nephews have now appeared that they exceed the number of fifteen," it was written from Rome on 27 January 1560. [161] Two of them, both still very young - Carlo Borromeo, immediately appointed archbishop of Milan and endowed with rich ecclesiastical revenues, and Giovanni Antonio Serbelloni - were created cardinals in the first promotion of 31 January, together with Giovanni de' Medici, the not-yet-seventeen-year-old son of the Duke of Florence. The following year they were joined by another nephew, Marco Sittich von Hohenems (Altemps), a soldier devoid of all religious sensitivity but capable of amassing an enormous fortune in a short time. "The pope concerns himself with nothing but enriching and promoting his own," Vergerio wrote to the Duke of Württemberg on 28 June 1560. [162] The pope's illegitimate children were also known in Rome, which contributed to Pastor's judgment that he was "personally stained by many defects." [163]

Trained in law, though not without literary interests, Pius IV possessed solid judicial experience and took pride in the reputation for impartiality and wisdom he had earned in the magistracies he had exercised. Yet he was wholly lacking in theological culture, which the times demanded, and therefore preferred to abstain from every intervention in the trials of the Holy Office. Still, it escaped no one "that the ordinary manner of the inquisitors in proceeding with such rigor against the accused was not to his satisfaction, and that he would have preferred them to use the methods of courteous gentlemen rather than severe friars." [164] His distancing from Paul IV's heretical obsessions and from the autocratic manner in which his predecessor had addressed political questions was therefore clear: "for whereas the other used to say that the rank of pontiffs existed to place emperors and kings beneath their feet, this one says that without the authority of princes that of the pontiffs cannot be preserved." The contrast was equally visible in his treatment of cardinals - although he would soon come to distrust and esteem many of them little, "recognizing them all in general as self-interested" [165] - in his physical vigor, in the simplicity and benevolence of his manner, and in his inclination toward a "private and free life," renouncing Pope Carafa's haughty "majesty," [166] though he shared his impatience.

4. The Defense

As we have seen, from the end of June the Milanese cardinal had begun preparing his defense and asking for an extension of the deadline granted to him. [167] From the outset the petitions presented by his advocates to assert his right to enter the conclave outlined his defensive strategy, both on the merits of the accusations and on canonical grounds. These were weeks of feverish labor: "admonitions" delivered to his collaborators, probably from Milan; legal opinions sent by Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga; autograph notes; annotations added to the *confessio* and to the articles of accusation; an *Instructio ad articulos Fisci*; letters from friends and collaborators. [168] These are fragments of a collective effort of which the surviving documentation offers only a few traces. We do not know, for example, what Anna Morone Stampa was referring to when, on 25 August, she replied to a letter sent three days earlier by Giovan Francesco Stella, from which she had learned "how hard you are working together with Messer Vincenzo [Stella] on the writings I sent you." [169] Yet there is no doubt that by then she had already received a first and then a second draft of the articles her brother was preparing to submit to the tribunal in view of the defensive proceedings being prepared in several Italian cities. On 7 August, in fact, the Marchioness of Soncino had written to Stella to warn him that from Rome "so far there is nothing but certain articles," whose transcription she would send him promptly. On the 16th she then sent him some "writings, which are the answers you saw when you were here, and certain articles

newly sent to me with this last courier." [170] Those *articuli* had undoubtedly been drafted before the pope's death, since he is named in them as still living. [171] Moreover, on 9 August the Bishop of Camerino, Berardo Bongiovanni, replied to a specific questionnaire Morone had sent him, having written on 30 July to declare himself ready to testify on his behalf. [172]

All this helps explain how, already on 18 August 1559, as soon as Paul IV breathed his last, the cardinal's defenders were able to deliver to the Holy Office the voluminous collection of defensive documents into which flowed work begun in early October 1557, when delivery of the articles of the Apostolic Treasury 173 had made it possible to know the charges emerging from the preliminary phase of the trial. The collection, later supplemented with other papers in the months that followed, [174] included papal briefs and bulls; letters by distinguished prelates or addressed to them by the Milanese cardinal, intended to demonstrate the constant trust placed in him by Paul III and Julius III; evidence of his indefatigable commitment to defending the Roman Church during his nunciatures in Germany; documents relating to the pastoral government of the dioceses of Modena and Novara; episcopal edicts; extracts from correspondence with the vicar and the Roman Curia; letters from zealous friars and severe inquisitors proving the diligence with which he had striven to eradicate heresies; and finally some of his own writings on religious subjects. The documents collected and examined were presumably numerous, not only in Rome but elsewhere as well, in Modena for example, as attested by a notarial act of 18 August 1559 listing some that Morone had asked to be sought among the papers left at his death by the Modenese notary and banker Niccolò Fontanella, formerly a tenant of lands and shops belonging to the bishopric. [175] None of them, however, would be added to those he delivered to the Holy Office that same day: perhaps because they did not offer particularly significant proof of innocence, perhaps because they did not reach Rome in time, or because the search ceased in view of the turn events had taken. In any case, the result was a substantial dossier of 111 documents, intended not only to support the cardinal's innocence but also to demonstrate his long service in defense of the Church and the faith, as the defensive memoranda drafted by his advocates likewise sought to show. [176]

Meanwhile, as papers were gathered, advocates consulted, and contacts made with possible witnesses, in various Italian cities Morone's friends and collaborators spent the summer of 1559 seeking people willing to testify on his behalf. These were genuine counter-trials, through which the defendant was entitled, "with witnesses more numerous and also of better standing than those of the Treasury, to prove that he did not say or do what is alleged against him in the place and at the time asserted by the witnesses, or not in that manner nor with those words which those witnesses say, but with others and in another fashion." For this purpose both "approving" witnesses could be summoned - that is, those willing positively to support and document the defendant's innocence by recalling facts and circumstances attesting his orthodoxy - and "disapproving" witnesses, capable of disqualifying those who asserted the contrary as his "capital enemies" or as responsible for having "suborned others to testify falsely against him." [177] Manuals of inquisitorial procedure describe this phase of the trial in detail, a genuine battle, as Francisco Peña's *Praxis inquisitorum* puts it, in which the defendant could fight the fiscal prosecutor's case either by denying the facts or by delegitimizing the witnesses. [178]

He now had the right to draft a questionnaire, the defensive *articuli*, to which further questions might gradually be added, to indicate the persons who should be heard, and eventually to supplement their list. [179] The Apostolic Treasury, by contrast, had the task of presenting the *interrogatoria* - "which shall directly strike each of the aforesaid articles" [180] - to be put to the deponents. [181] Once these preliminary documents had been acquired, the Holy Office could begin examining the witnesses, whom the inquisitors were to hear "first upon the Treasury's interrogatories and then upon the defendant's articles." [182] In the defensive inquiries, in other words, the roles were reversed with respect to the accusatory phase of the trial: it was now the defendant who presented exculpatory documents, solicited depositions in his favor, and indicated the questions to be put to the witnesses, [183] who could also be heard by letters rogatory, as happened for example in the contemporary case against Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice. [184] Although letters rogatory were not normally granted in criminal trials, the tribunal could permit them when the persons named by the defendant resided in distant places or in different dioceses, or were old and ill, of high social rank, or finally nuns. In

the first two cases the practice of the Roman Holy Office was to entrust their examination to the inquisitor of the diocese, even without informing the bishop. [185] This is precisely what happened in Morone's case, whose advocates on the very day of Pope Carafa's death were able to deliver to the tribunal the defensive *articuli* - or a first draft of them - and the first lists of witnesses to be

to summon, insisting that the brevity of the time allowed for the defense required the utmost dispatch.

Paralyzed by the pope's death and by the convulsive events leading up to the conclave, the Holy Office was caught off guard and forced to yield to Morone's initiative. As early as 31 August, the first defense witness was heard in Rome; his examination was accompanied by a note from an inquisitorial official of the stature of Giovan Battista Brugnatelli 186, who was forced to admit that "the fiscal prosecutor has drawn up no interrogatory" and that provisional questions therefore had to be formulated, as was also done for the next deposition on 9 September 187. Another letter was sent to Bologna on the 6th, giving instructions for the examination of the priest Niccolò Bargellesi - also named by the cardinal - whose very poor health made the matter especially urgent 188. The opening of the conclave on 5 September brought everything to a halt pending the election of the new pope, whose political and religious inclinations would be decisive for the course of the trial. As soon as the new pontiff had been elected, on 30 December, the Milanese cardinal rejoiced with Ferdinand I of Habsburg and Seripando that the choice had fallen on Gian Angelo de' Medici, Pius IV, "a lover of peace and justice and full of charity" 189. Yet already the day before, immediately after leaving the conclave, he had taken care to write to Philip II to thank him for his decisive intervention, fully aware that "the nature of the late pope was such that justice and innocence were not enough to defend men from persecution, and the authority of the whole world would not have sufficed to free them from His Holiness's hands." He also informed the king that he would devote all his strength to bringing the trial to a conclusion "by the ordinary course of law [...] with the restoration of my honor and to Your Majesty's satisfaction, who will recognize that you have favored a man wholly innocent of the charges brought against him" 190.

The events of the following weeks must therefore be assessed against the background of Pius IV's protection of Morone, under which the case moved "precipitately," as someone would later say 191, toward its now foregone conclusion. Already on 29 December a Roman newsletter reported that the newly elected pope had ordered apartments in the palace to be prepared for the Milanese cardinal, "whose services His Holiness is thought likely to employ in affairs," as the Venetian ambassador Alvise Mocenigo also confirmed 192. While numerous letters of congratulation arrived from friends and acquaintances, all now certain of his imminent acquittal and no longer afraid to expose themselves to risk, Morone came to appear to the most perceptive observers as the "head in the management of affairs of state," as was written from Blois to London on 18 January, or as the pope's chief adviser "in all important business" 193. "I hear that Morone is greatly favored by the pope, and this is no surprise to me, since - in addition to their kinship - there has always been great friendship between them," Carnesecchi wrote to Donna Giulia on 3 January 1560 194. In those days, to a man of letters such as Dionigi Atanagi, formerly close to the spirituali, it seemed "that at the mere name of Pope Pius not only afflicted Rome and Italy, but all battered Christendom, rises and breathes again after the cruel calamities and ruin by which it has for so many years been miserably storm-tossed and oppressed." For his part, the pope made no secret of his intention to regain control of the Holy Office and curb its encroachments, beginning with Morone's case: "The defense proceedings are moving forward, and there is no doubt that he will be acquitted and become the pope's favorite," Laínez wrote from Rome to Salmerón on 7 January 195.

By that date the defensive proceedings promoted by Morone were virtually complete, beginning with the Roman inquiry, hastily opened between late August and early September 1559 with the examination of two witnesses, and resumed only after the Apostolic Fiscal Prosecutor's *interrogatoria* were submitted on 18 December 196. Thirty-three witnesses were summoned: some members of Morone's household, several Bolognese or Brescian patricians, a few Modenese men of letters, and above all a large group of churchmen, including twenty-one bishops and the master general of the Dominican Order, all ready to attest to the Milanese cardinal's piety, zeal, doctrinal orthodoxy, and moral rigor, sometimes limiting themselves to recalling his unfailingly devout participation in the sacred rites required by his rank and offices. The last witness heard in Rome gave evidence on 16 January 1560. Meanwhile, on 20-21 December, on the eve of Pius IV's election, the tribunal prepared letters appointing as commissioners of the Holy Office the bishops or episcopal vicars and inquisitors who were to preside over the defensive proceedings by commission in

Bologna, Cremona, Ferrara, Milan, Modena, Novara, and Venice 197. Another would shortly afterward be instituted in Forlì to question Antonio Bernardi della Mirandola, bishop of Caserta, then residing at the abbey of Dovadola, a protégé of the Farnese family and an old friend of Morone. On 1 January he had written to the cardinal, urging him to remember “that I yield to no one in the world in loving, revering, and honoring you; and would to God I had the power to show it, as I would have done had I been able” 198.

The appointments were signed by Fra Tommaso Scotti, commissioner general of the Roman Holy Office, whom Paul IV had entrusted with the investigation of the Milanese cardinal as early as June 1555, and by the notary Claudio de Valle. Attached were the defendant’s defensive articles and the Fiscal Prosecutor’s *interrogatoria* 199. Between 6 and 19 January, the Cremonese inquiry was held with twenty witnesses, most of them prominent citizens called upon to recall an episode in which Morone had zealously collaborated with the Roman Holy Office 200. A kind of appendix to it was the proceeding held in Forlì from 13 to 16 January, limited to the examination of the bishop of Caserta, who was called to refute - as he had already done in a letter sent to Astorre Paleotti on 14 July 1559 201 - a specific charge in connection with which Bartolomeo della Pergola had implicated him 202. The Cremonese proceeding was closely supervised by a member of the local aristocracy, Adalberto Pallavicino, Morone’s brother-in-law as the widower of his sister Angela. He did not fail to coach the witnesses properly, as is evident from the identical profession, repeated in no fewer than fourteen of the twenty depositions, that each was a “servant of the aforesaid most reverend cardinal, because he is the person he is.”

Meanwhile, on 19 January, the “solicitors” in Morone’s case, the patricians Giovan Battista and Polidoro Castelli, appeared at the archiepiscopal palace in Bologna to deliver Tommaso Scotti’s letter and the documents attached to it to the vicar Sebastiano Rolandi and the city’s inquisitor, Eustachio Locatelli 203. In compliance with the supreme tribunal’s instructions, the defensive inquiry was opened without delay: the first witnesses were sworn and the examinations began. In Bologna too everything proceeded with the utmost speed, and here as well it is difficult to avoid the impression that the witnesses had been given precise prompts as to what it would be useful to say, as suggested, for example, by the recurring statement that Morone’s household “looked like so many Observant friars.” Those already approached in the summer and autumn probably corresponded to the persons whose names appeared on an initial provisional list sent from Rome 204; others were added during the inquiry 205. Some in fact declared that they had been asked by the cardinal’s procurators to testify only “about fifteen days ago,” “in recent days,” or even “the other day” or “the other morning.” Between 19 January and 10 February, thirty people took the preliminary oath in the archiepiscopal palace or at San Domenico, the seat of the Inquisition, although not all were ultimately called to give evidence.

When the examinations were complete, the proceedings thus assembled were formally declared closed on the 7th 206 and, immediately copied into a bulky dossier, sent to Rome, where as early as 27 January Gualteruzzi could write to Beccadelli that “Morone is in supreme authority; within a few days his trial will be completed - I mean, his acquittal” 207. The volume containing the Bolognese depositions was entrusted to Giovan Battista Castelli, with instructions to deliver it immediately to Cardinal Alessandrino or Tommaso Scotti 208. The delivery and subsequent dispatch to Rome, however, took place in two installments, probably to prevent delays in copying from holding up the Roman tribunal’s work. A first packet was ready to be sent when the proceeding was formally closed on 7 February, while a second followed around the middle of the month 209. It may therefore be assumed that by about 20 February all the material collected in Bologna had reached Rome.

Other defensive inquiries were then under way in Modena, Milan, Novara, and Venice, as we have seen 210, although only faint traces of their records survive, perhaps because they remained in the hands of the consultors who read them in great haste on the eve of the sentence, without time to have copies made. No fragment survives of the Ferrarese inquiry, though we know it had been opened, perhaps because it was never completed or perhaps because it reached Rome too late to be taken into account. The dispatch to Modena of the accused cardinal’s articles and the Apostolic Fiscal Prosecutor’s *interrogatoria* is, however, attested 211. There, in July 1559, the aforementioned Antonio Bernardi, writing on behalf of the duke of

Parma and Piacenza, had approached Francesco Bellencini, a prestigious jurist and advocate who had himself had causes of friction with Morone in the past, asking him to induce “some qualified men to testify.” Bellencini immediately set to work, as he himself informed Ottavio Farnese at the end of the month, reporting that he had “found the men, who will not fail when called upon” 212. This is indeed what happened, as emerges from a letter written several months later, on 3 February 1560, by Juan Guerrea, rector of the Jesuit college in Modena, to Laínez. He informed him of the arrival of Morone’s agents, charged with examining witnesses for the defense, an event that revived the never entirely dormant controversy over Salmerón’s expulsion in 1543, still one of the chief reasons for the hatred directed against the Society, which the affair was now rekindling. He added that a prominent citizen whose name he did not give, closely connected to the Jesuits and a great friend of the inquisitor, had whispered in his ear that no one had arranged for him to testify, because he might have harmed the case 213.

As for Milan, the cardinal’s native city, there could be no doubt that the flower of the citizenry would be called upon to attest to his religious orthodoxy, personal rigor, political commitment in defense of the Church and the papacy, and pastoral zeal. On 24 January 1560 the Mantuan resident Giorgio Visconti informed Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga that “Cardinal Morone’s trial papers have arrived in Milan, and it is intended to examine witnesses in his favor.” Three days later Ottavio Farnese was told by his agent in the Lombard capital “that, for the justification of Cardinal Morone and the annulment of his trial, people have been sent here to examine witnesses of good repute and standing, and that the president of the Senate has already been examined” 214. By mid-February or shortly thereafter, the records of the inquiries held in Bologna, Milan, Modena, Novara, and Venice had reached the inquisitors, as shown by the inclusion of a few brief extracts from them in a substantial summary of the Morone trial drawn up on the eve of the sentence 215. Both the cardinal and Pius IV were anxious to conclude the affair, a fundamental prerequisite for the inauguration of a new course in papal policy, aimed at drastically limiting the powers of the Holy Office and reviving the conciliar initiative. If we are to believe what a member of Ercole Gonzaga’s household wrote to him from Rome on 10 January 1560 - the very day Pius IV signed Egidio Foscarari’s acquittal 216 - Morone even joined the pope at the meeting of the congregation of the Holy Office that was supposed to judge him 217.

Chapter Eighteen

“Morone Enjoys Great Reputation and Authority”: The Pontificate of Pius IV

1. “Innocent and Most Innocent”: The Sentence

On 3 February 1560 a Roman newsletter reported that Morone had insisted to Pius IV that “his absolution be declared by way of justice and not of grace, as until now it appears to stand; and thus it is thought that he will be discharged very soon, since he is greatly favored by the pope” 1. In fact, it was not until early March that the cardinalitial commission appointed by Pius IV to conclude the trial was able to finish examining the thousands of papers that the Milanese cardinal and his lawyers had submitted to the tribunal in the preceding months. Among them were the substantial defensive memorials drafted by Marcantonio Borghese and Antonio Massa, which *in facto* scrutinized the trial records with punctilious care, emphasizing the weakness and contradictions of the prosecution’s case, and *in iure* undermined its validity 2. At the beginning of 1560 these opinions were supplemented by a text from Girolamo Parisetto denying the legitimacy of any request to subject Morone to canonical purgation 3, perhaps in response to a final attempt by the inquisitors to avert his acquittal. That immense body of defensive documentation offered more than enough to a pontiff determined to use the occasion to subordinate the Holy Office to papal authority. Once the substance had been decided, in short, only the procedures remained to be observed. The change in climate was obvious to everyone: on 17 February, for example, the pope summoned all the bishops residing in Rome to urge them to return to and reside in their dioceses, and to appoint a protector who would attend to their needs at the curia. This was immediately done in the Sistine Chapel, Morone being charged with asking their wishes and reporting back 4.

On 20 February 1560, just as the echoes of the celebrations for his election had died away, and the day after - if not the very day on which - the last part of the copy of the defensive proceedings, sent from Bologna on the 14th, was delivered to the tribunal 5, Pius IV issued a *motu proprio* by which he reserved the case to himself 6. He thereby removed it from the supreme inquisitors and opened the conflict with the Holy Office that would mark his pontificate. Carnesecchi too, having hastened to Rome in the certainty that the new pontiff, who owed everything to Cosimo de’ Medici, would absolve him from the sentence in absentia pronounced by Paul IV 7, announced to Gonzaga the imminent “discharge of the case of the most reverend Morone,” which would clear the way for his own “through his authority and favor with the pope, with whom he is thought to have more influence than anyone else of his order, though at present he does not dare open his mouth and almost pretends not to know me.” Pius IV’s political and religious direction was still unclear, he added, but if he placed “the helm in the hands of the most reverend Morone” and pressed the inquisitors to conclude the trial so hard “that he gives them no time to breathe, there can be no doubt that His Most Reverend Lordship will govern this vessel in such a way that, despite any storm, it will be brought safely into harbor” 8.

Convinced that the tempest had now passed, the Florentine protonotary failed to understand what the Milanese cardinal had grasped perfectly: that nothing would return to the way it had been, and that although the inquisitors now had to step aside and swallow their bitterness, they were ready to regain the upper hand at the first opportunity. Carnesecchi himself, as we shall see, would soon discover this; so too would Pius IV, despite the firm intentions and initiatives with which he began his pontificate 9. Few men had experienced at first hand, as Morone had, the determination - not to say the fanaticism - of those friars who had risen to the highest levels of the papal curia by virtue of their orthodox zeal and were convinced that they alone could save the Church. He had learned his lesson and understood that, to protect his own precarious future, he had to avoid imprudence, shun suspect associations, and display absolute doctrinal irreproachability and obedience to papal authority. The days of Valdesian enthusiasm were dead and buried, and Carnesecchi now represented in his eyes only the long shadow of an embarrassing past. Carnesecchi, by contrast, had lived

serenely as a great gentleman in Venice throughout Paul IV's pontificate, safe under Cosimo de' Medici's protection, and had regarded what had happened not as a turning point but as a parenthesis. He therefore struggled to understand the newly freed cardinal's coolness, failing to grasp the political and religious meaning of the dramatic experience Morone had undergone during his long and humiliating imprisonment. "As for Morone," he wrote to Donna Giulia on 10 February 1560, "I am not quite decided whether the epithet of St Patrick's Well suits him or not; but if it does, I believe his fault is more timidity than malice, for since I came here I have found him exceedingly timid - so much so that I would never have believed it had I not had to experience it in my own case" 10.

Galeazzo Florimonte fell victim to a similar misunderstanding. On 12 January 1561 he wrote to his old friend Ludovico Beccadelli, then Morone's guest in Rome, complaining that he had received no news of their common "patron," though he knew "with the greatest pleasure that he enjoys great authority with His Holiness" and "has a large share in the government of the Church" 11. This made him hope to "see deeds worthy of that generous spirit and distinguished intellect" in the increasingly unavoidable reform of the Church 12. Yet the following year the bishop of Sessa, now nearly eighty, would have to acknowledge that he was "out of favor" with the Milanese cardinal, without the slightest idea why 13. "I am so jealous of the old goodwill that the Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Morone used to bear me that I fear Your Lordship too [...] may dislike me, seeing me in his disfavor," he wrote again at Trent on 12 July 1562. He suspected that this "hostile opinion" toward him might have arisen either because he had never written during or after Morone's imprisonment, or because of some unspecified reproach he had made during the legation at Bologna. He therefore asked Beccadelli to discover how matters stood and help restore him "to his good graces" 14, finally accepting his advice to take comfort in "the agreement of our judgment with the dead," an obvious reference to Pole, "since the living want none of it" 15. A few months later, on 23 March and again on 17 April 1563, when the Milanese cardinal was to be sent to preside over the council, Florimonte returned to the matter with Beccadelli, asking him to investigate with his "usual tact" the reasons for Morone's incomprehensible hostility toward one who "used to be his intimate servant" and had never done or said "anything unworthy of His Most Reverend Lordship's love and favor" 16.

Beccadelli himself, a sorrowful spectator of Morone's trial from distant Ragusa, deluded himself that Paul IV's death had finally closed an ill-fated but transient season. Throughout his stay in the Dalmatian diocese he had maintained occasional epistolary contact with the cardinal 17, and when he returned to Rome in November 1560 - one coming from Milan, the other from Bologna - he lived in Morone's palace in Trastevere, where he remained until August 1561, when he left for Trent 18. Eager to enter his household 19, he repeatedly praised his host's "affectionate kindness" and "most delightful company," and the quiet of a residence where they lived "as though in the country," far from the throng crowding the papal curia 20. Yet only a few months later at Trent, as we shall see, he was forced to recognize the rapid deterioration of their relations because of a profound disagreement over one of the principal questions before the council 21. From there Gualteruzzi informed him on 12 November 1562 that he sometimes visited Morone, though he no longer drew from those visits "the full consolation" he had once enjoyed 22.

In reality, as the cardinal was among the first to understand, it was the season opened by the election of Pius IV that proved temporary; at his death, the papal keys would pass to Fra Michele Ghislieri. To be sure, that season made it possible to pacify Rome's relations with the Habsburg courts, calm the inquisitorial storm unleashed by Pope Carafa, and bring the Council of Trent to a conclusion. The credit for this success belonged above all to Morone's diplomatic skill. Yet even before going to Trent he sent almost threatening messages to Beccadelli and Foscarari, despite his former close ties to both, to make them abandon their efforts in favor of episcopal residence *de iure divino*, leaving them bitterly dismayed 23. At the beginning of 1560 Carnesecchi and Beccadelli still imagined that their hopes for renewal had some room to maneuver, that the council might revise certain decrees and reopen some narrow passage. Morone, by contrast, was among the first to understand that Pope Medici's pontificate might allow the accounts of the past to be settled, but certainly not permit the defeated illusions of the spirituali of the 1540s to be revived for the future. What might perhaps be done instead was to exploit that precarious moment of strength to shelter their

last heirs from further inquisitorial attacks. In January and February 1560, then, the Florentine protonotary failed to see what appeared clear to Morone's gaze: a man capable of detecting every rustle in the Roman curia while at the same time surveying the entire chessboard of European politics and the profound transformations then under way.

When Carnesecchi returned to Rome, moreover, the echoes of what had happened at Paul IV's death still lingered: the statue on the Capitol thrown into the Tiber, the greedy nephews imprisoned, the Carafa coats of arms torn down throughout Rome, the Holy Office and the Dominican convent of Santa Maria sopra Minerva stormed and set ablaze, prisoners of the Inquisition freed by the mob, and inquisitors soundly beaten. Pius IV then seemed to place the Milanese cardinal's acquittal at the top of his agenda, making it the very premise of his political and religious program. In reporting events to Gonzaga on 10 February 1560, Carnesecchi even said he hoped the trial would be concluded "within eight or ten days at most" 24. Everything did in fact proceed rapidly under the driving direction of a pope determined to end the affair as soon as possible with a sentence that would amount to a spectacular repudiation of the Holy Office. This was also intended to prevent a repetition of what had occurred in the conclaves of the preceding decade, which had turned the papal curia into a treacherous receptacle of insinuations, suspicions, accusations, unscrupulous political maneuvers, paid informers, secret trials, and bitter personal clashes.

On 22 February the protonotary declared himself certain that the cardinal recently released from prison would be "discharged very swiftly and most happily," and on the 24th Gualteruzzi echoed him in a letter to Beccadelli: "within a few days he will be fully reinstated" 25. It is significant that, besides reserving the case to himself, in the *motu proprio* of 20 February 1560 Pope Medici entrusted the task of reporting on its merits to two authoritative members of the inquisitorial congregation, one as a jurist and the other as a theologian: Giacomo Puteo and Michele Ghislieri, both hostile to their colleague still awaiting sentence. The appointment was strange only in appearance, for it arose from the imbalance in the balance of power, then entirely in favor of Pius IV and therefore of Morone. In this way they meant formally to bind the two cardinals - especially Ghislieri, who had directed the trial from the outset and still held its papers - to the foregone acquittal. The next day, 21 February, the Milanese cardinal's lawyers resubmitted to the tribunal the same *protestatio* by which, on 7 October 1557, when he received the formal articles of accusation from the Apostolic Fiscal Prosecutor, he had professed his innocence, challenged certain witnesses as his notorious enemies, requested disclosure of the names of those who had testified, and sought an extension in which to draw up his *interrogatoria* 26. Two days later, on the 23rd, no doubt under strong pressure from above, four eminent theologians - Tomás Manrique, master of the Sacred Palace; the Spanish Dominican Melchor Cano; Cristoforo da Padova, prior general of the Augustinians; and Giovan Giacomo Barba, papal sacristan - some of them undoubtedly *obtorto collo*, signed at the foot of Morone's *confessio* an attestation that everything stated in it was fully orthodox, thereby depriving the inquisitors of one of the principal sources of their accusations 27.

It was then that a long *Summarium* was drawn up from the thousands of trial papers now in the tribunal's possession. It appears to contain two distinct documents, probably the work of two different consultors 28: a short extract from the depositions against Morone and his own examinations, followed by a longer and more detailed analysis of the Apostolic Fiscal Prosecutor's articles, countered by evidence to the contrary found in the prosecution's own documentation - especially the examinations and the *confessio* - and above all in the defensive material submitted by the accused 29. This *Summarium* of the trial records seems to preserve, so to speak, the final arguments of prosecution and defense: the former now reduced to a faint voice speaking only from official duty and for the sake of form, the latter able to break through the adversary's position - five pages for one, forty-nine for the other. The author or authors of the second part were also able to consult the lost defensive proceedings conducted in Milan, Modena, Novara, and Venice 30, although these are mentioned only rarely, as well as those held in Bologna (cited only once), Cremona, and Forlì (never cited), perhaps because they reached Rome too late to be properly studied. Only the Roman proceeding, the first to be completed, on 16 January 1560 31, and the lost record of Niccolò Bargellesi's testimony in Bologna in

early September 1559 32 were used at any length in these pages, which were therefore drafted largely between late January and early February 1560, with only a few later additions.

The copy of the sentence of acquittal that Pius IV would shortly afterward hand to Morone in person 33, recording the formal acts that took place between the *motu proprio* of 20 February and the consistorial approval of 13 March, allows us to follow the events. As soon as Ghislieri and Puteo received the *motu proprio*, they transmitted it to Sebastiano Attracino, procurator of the Apostolic Fiscal Office. Once the unlikely possibility that he might challenge its legitimacy had been excluded, it fell to him to contest the defendant's defensive documentation and to express himself, orally or in writing, on the merits of the entire case at the earliest possible date. An indisposition of Puteo caused some delay 34, but by early March rumors were already circulating that the next consistory would finally approve the sentence and that on 5 March, as a newsletter of the 2nd reported, "the affairs of Morone and Carnesecchi will be completely settled" 35. On 4 March Carnesecchi informed Gonzaga that he had heard from Filippo Gheri himself that the cardinal's case "will be settled at the first consistory, perhaps tomorrow morning, with all the solemnities and circumstances that can make that lord's innocence appear and shine more clearly before the world" 36.

That same day Attracino appeared before the pope to perform his official role as prosecutor, after which the two judges appointed by the pontiff were left to report on all the findings of the prosecution and defense and to submit a report - perhaps the *Summarium* mentioned above, though more likely a lost condensation of it - countersigned by Attracino, in which he attested to the defendant's "cleanness," as Alessandro Milani, one of Morone's defense witnesses in the Roman proceeding, wrote to Mantua on the 7th 37. On 5 March, again at the cardinal's request, the fiscal procurator was summoned once more before the pope to urge the conclusion of the procedure 38. Everything took place under Pius IV's careful direction, and the inquisitorial congregation as such was never consulted and took no part in the affair, of which there is consequently no trace in the *Decreta*.

All formal requirements having been completed, on 6 March 1560 Girolamo Parisetto, acting as Morone's procurator, was therefore able to submit the "humble petition" in which, declaring himself convinced that the report presented by Ghislieri and Puteo had dispelled every doubt about his patron's innocence, he asked the pope to pronounce sentence. The sentence, he specified, should first declare the entire trial unjust and void, and then absolve Morone from every charge and suspicion, "declaring that he had been found innocent and free from every stain or suspicion of alleged heresy," and that all Catholics were to regard him as such 39. This was indeed the literal tenor of the sentence issued that same day in the bull *Inter caeteras pastoralis curae*. After asserting the propriety of entrusting the judgment to two cardinal-inquisitors whom Paul IV himself had already placed on the commission appointed to conclude the case, and on the basis of their report, Pius IV declared Morone's imprisonment under his predecessor - "and perhaps by his order" - wholly unlawful because of the absolute lack of evidence, and likewise the investigations against him and the entire trial, which he therefore annulled and quashed. As a further safeguard for the future, the pope proclaimed that the very records of the case demonstrated that the cardinal was "free not only from guilt but from every suspicion." He therefore decreed his full acquittal "as innocent and most innocent," condemned as "rash, unjust, unlawful, and inequitable" the inquisitorial harassment he had suffered, and imposed perpetual silence on everyone regarding those unjust calumnies 40.

As early as 9 March, even before the consistorial approval, Michele Facchetto - a former member of Pole's household who had entered Morone's service - could inform Giovan Francesco Stella in Brescia of the sentence "given by the two cardinals, namely the Most Reverend Monsignor Puteo and Alessandrino, which sentence is as follows: they absolve His Most Reverend Lordship, finding him not only innocent but most innocent" 41. In reality, Cardinal Alessandrino and the Holy Office can only have regarded it as a shameful repudiation of what, in their view, the inquisitorial proceedings had established beyond reasonable doubt concerning the heresies professed by Morone. The pope was fully aware of this, and precisely for that reason insisted that his own signature at the foot of the sentence be accompanied by those of *servulus Iacobus Puteus* and *humillima Sanctitatis Vestrae creatura* Michele Ghislieri 42. Ghislieri had in fact been forced to do the same little more than a month earlier, on 10 January 1560, when he had also been called upon to sign

Egidio Foscarari's sentence of acquittal 43. Beneath the shadow of that acquittal, then, weapons were being sharpened for future battles, proof of how deep were the rifts that had opened at the summit of the Church in the 1540s, growing ever more bitter until in the following decade they became the bleeding wounds of which Morone had suffered the most painful, and whose consequences he would endure for the rest of his life.

For the moment, however, the Milanese cardinal could not only bring a nightmare to an end but also secure certain guarantees for the future, all the more precious because on the very eve of the sentence, 5 March 1560, at Toledo, Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla had once again raised against him the charge of having professed heretical views on justification even after the Tridentine decree of 1547. This may have been the first document to enter the new inquisitorial dossier assembled by Pope Pius V 44, who was likewise eager to contradict his predecessor, despite the written assent extorted from him at the foot of the acquittal. Immediately after it was signed, on that same 6 March 1560, the sentence was promulgated by the pope in his private apartment in the presence, as witnesses, of Michele Ghislieri; another cardinal-inquisitor of strict Carafian obedience, the Theatine Bernardino Scotti; the datary Ludovico Simonetta, who had some time before testified in Morone's favor 45; and a severe inquisitorial official, Giovan Battista Brugnatelli 46. That long "business" could thus finally be considered concluded, "at least as far as the inquisitors are concerned," Carnesecchi observed on 9 March, informing Donna Giulia that the pontiff had now signed the sentence and was preparing to publish it officially in consistory, "more as a ceremony and an excessive precaution and satisfaction for that lord than for any other effect" 47.

The previous evening, as Facchetto wrote from Rome to Stella, Pope Medici had withdrawn for two hours into his rooms with Morone alone, speaking to him "with the greatest joy" about the conclusion of the long-running trial and announcing his intention "to send a brief concerning this matter to all the Christian princes," and afterward telling Facchetto that he "had no dearer friend than the Most Reverend Cardinal Morone" 48. The consistory met on Wednesday, 13 March, and on the eve Francisco Vargas reported the news to the Spanish sovereign, announcing that Morone had already been solemnly declared free and that the following day the "muy honrrada" sentence would be read in consistory. Bearing the papal seal, signed by Puteo and Ghislieri, and countersigned by Alessandro Farnese as vice-chancellor of the Holy Roman Church, the sentence of acquittal was read and unanimously approved by the Sacred College, as a Roman newsletter reported that same day 49. "The most reverend cardinals [...] vied with one another to be the first to praise that sentence. The whole court generally displays great rejoicing over it," Facchetto wrote to Stella on 16 March, while congratulations from prominent figures accumulated among the Milanese cardinal's papers 50.

News sheets, dispatches, and letters made the contents of the sentence known everywhere. A magnificent copy has survived, written in elegant script on parchment and embellished with miniatures of the pope's and Morone's coats of arms 51, which Pius IV had authenticated by Claudio de Valle, notary of the Holy Office, before presenting it to him (plates 3-4). On 18 March, it seems, the acquittal was also proclaimed in the church of Santa Maria in Trastevere 52, of which Morone had long been titular as a cardinal-priest before being promoted to the suburbicarian see of Albano at the consistory of the 13th. As he had announced, between 18 and 22 March the pope communicated the sentence to Italian and European princes in special briefs, also addressed to the Universities of Paris and Louvain 53, thereby giving it particular solemnity. Immediately printed by Antonio Blado in several issues 54, it would be disseminated "as far as Constantinople," as the heresiarch Iacopo Paleologo, who had escaped from the Ripetta prison in August 1559, would later recall 55. On 13 May, when the nuncio in Vienna, Stanisław Hosjusz, delivered the papal brief to him, Emperor Maximilian II expressed the liveliest satisfaction, remarking that the Milanese cardinal "had not been the only one struck by so great an ignominy" 56. The brief addressed to Philip II was carried to Spain by Filippo Gheri 57, the "soul," the "spirit of Morone," who arrived at Toledo on 20 November and remained there for three weeks 58. The purpose of the mission was above all to express Morone's gratitude, "because of the obligation I have to kiss His Majesty's hands for the many favors I have received from him and at the same time to give him an account of my innocence and of the gratitude of my heart" 59. Among those favors was a gift of 1,500 ducats "in aid" for Sforza Morone, the cardinal's brother 60. But Gheri also intended to show the Catholic king the records of the trial against Pope Carafa's nephews, thereby frustrating

their attempt to draw closer to Spain, which had also manifested itself in the conclave through their support for Pope Medici's candidacy, and to sound out the monarch's willingness to support Morone's candidacy at the next vacancy of the Holy See, which Carlo Borromeo too was urging "warmly" 61.

It was presumably at this time that Morone had two medals struck with his profile on the obverse. On the reverse of one, a ray of light breaks through a threatening sky as VOX DE COELO, with the surrounding legend ET TENEBRAE EVM NON COMPREHENDERVNT; on the other, a palm bends but does not break, and beneath its branches two allegorical figures hold a scroll inscribed VIRTVTE ET CONSTANTIA (plate 5). The initiative for striking a third medal must undoubtedly be attributed to his sister Anna, who had followed her brother's dramatic ordeal with anxiety and devotion - perhaps in 1563, on his appointment as papal legate to the Council of Trent. In it the cardinal's effigy was presented as IO[ANNES] CAR[DINALIS] MORON[VS] FI[DEI] CATH[OLICAE] PROPVGN[ATOR] 62. In October he was able to return to his Milan and see his eighty-four-year-old mother 63, his sister, relatives, and friends, but the delicacy of the moment required his prompt return to the curia 64, not least because - if Carnesecchi is to be believed - the pope "openly professed that he could not and did not know how to live without that lord's company" 65. Pius IV confirmed him as protector of the Dominican Order 66, a role certainly unwelcome to the inquisitors, and on 6 September 1560, after Priuli's death, appointed him executor of Pole's will, in effect giving him a free hand over the papers the English cardinal had left behind. This showed his awareness that the conflict between the Holy Office and the last heirs and epigones of the spirituali was by no means over. Finally, on 23 April 1564, he granted Morone the *facultas testandi* 67, that is, the right to dispose in favor of his heirs even of property derived from ecclesiastical benefices.

2. Pius IV and the Holy Office

The Milanese cardinal's long inquisitorial ordeal could thus be considered over, at least for the moment. As late as 30 March 1560 a Roman newsletter reported a story, later proved unfounded, that "certain papers had been found which by order of the late pope were put away because they greatly favored the case of the Most Reverend Morone, and therefore he did not want them to be seen" 68. The trials also came to an end of Egidio Foscarari, bishop of Modena, acquitted on 10 January; Giovan Francesco Verdura, bishop of Messina, acquitted with Mario Galeota on 7 March 69; Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, bishop of Cava dei Tirreni, acquitted on 27 May 1560 70; Pietro Carnesecchi, who nevertheless had to wait more than a year, until 4 June 1561, after a long struggle between the Holy Office and the pope 71; and many others who had managed to escape after the assault on the Ripetta prison. Too quickly convinced that the inquisitorial storm that had overwhelmed him had passed once and for all, the Florentine protonotary commissioned a friend to design a striking emblem summarizing the whole affair in the image of "an elephant wounded on the ground, with many arrows in its body and snares around it, raising its eyes to a bright moon set in a starry sky, with the motto from Psalm 118: 'De mandatis tuis non erravi'" 72.

In comparison with the historic turn initiated by his predecessor, aimed at strengthening the normative and repressive authority of the Holy Office, Roman centralization, and papal autocracy, the reign of Pius IV represented "a parenthesis rich in alternative political possibilities, a period of muted resistance by the pontiff to the lines laid down by Paul IV, in an attempt to oppose the Inquisition's growing autonomy," to restore it to collegial direction, and above all to limit the enormous power acquired by Ghislieri 73. In some respects there was a return to the 1540s, with an effort to find forms of mediation with the German world, no longer centered "on the theological problem of justification by faith, but on concessions in matters of rites and ecclesiastical discipline," especially clerical marriage and communion *sub utraque* for the laity. As Zaccaria Dolfin, nuncio at the Viennese court, wrote in 1564, the widespread devotion that "many seem to have for the chalice leads them, when they cannot receive it from Catholics, to receive it from heretics" 74.

This, as will be recalled, was also the path Morone had tried to follow during his nunciatures in Germany, when he had consistently recommended firmness to the pope on "divine ordinances" and flexibility on "human" ones. Any innovation in the latter was undoubtedly "very dangerous, for it may well be believed that the Church of God, governed by the Holy Spirit, has always refined its rites and introduced the practices

best suited to bring man to the true worship of God"; yet these were still "matters that were *iuris positivi*" and therefore subject to contingent judgment, as he wrote from Hagenau on 8 June 1540. Hence his conviction that "if the diversity of times required change," accommodation was necessary, provided it occurred "with the authority of Our Lord or of the council," and that the pontiff therefore should not be "difficult about relaxing something in an honorable manner and without detriment to our religion" if this was "necessary or expedient for the peace of Germany and for union" 75. Morone's rise to the summit of curial power was thus rooted not only in personal relations, friendships, and kinship, but also in shared political views with the new pope. The Holy Office, naturally, took a very different position, convinced that such questions fell primarily within its own competence and little disposed to subtle distinctions between doctrine and liturgy, norms of faith and rules of law.

Pius IV's first acts made clear to everyone his intention to change course from his predecessor's political and religious policies, beginning with an explicit repudiation of his blind inquisitorial severity and "the terror and rigor of former times," as Carnesecchi wrote to Donna Giulia on 27 January 1560 76. From this perspective Pope Medici immediately sought to mitigate some of Paul IV's harshest measures 77, including the Index of Prohibited Books published at the end of 1558 - a means, Sarpi would write, "of aggrandizing the authority of the Roman court by depriving men of the knowledge necessary to defend themselves against its usurpations" 78 - entrusting Seripando with its revision 79. His main objective, however, was to reduce the role acquired by the supreme tribunal of faith during the preceding decade. Already on 6 January, the day of his coronation, two Roman newsletters reported that the pope had announced his intention to abolish "the Inquisitions everywhere, leaving their charge to the bishops of the places" 80, and that he "wished to restore the tribunal of the Inquisition, but so that it should concern itself with nothing except sins belonging solely to heresy, and that he did not wish to call anyone to account for things done under the bedclothes." Another, shortly afterward, announced imminent measures under which the tribunal was to concern itself with "nothing other than matters touching the faith, so that there is great satisfaction here" 81. On 7 March the reform commission meeting *coram sanctissimo*, in which Pius IV included no inquisitor, proposed that bishops should be summoned to Rome only for very serious causes. In the following months the pope worked to expand their authority in matters of heresy at the expense of the Holy Office and the "scoundrels" entrenched within it 82. In early August he spoke very favorably of Alvise Priuli to the Venetian ambassador Marcantonio Da Mula, declaring that he attached no importance to the veto Pope Carafa had placed on Priuli's episcopal appointment, since Carafa "rushed about in those furies of his imprisoning and defaming people, as he did even Cardinal Morone." After hearing Morone's opinion, "who was his friend," he said he intended to give Priuli the diocese of Verona instead of Brescia 83. A few days later, on 19 August, the pontiff declined to attend the *exequiae anniversariae* of his predecessor at Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the church of the Dominicans and the Inquisition 84.

In the following months Pope Medici would attempt to regain control of the Holy Office through a series of measures designed to limit its powers, though he failed to impair its substantive autonomy. The direct confrontation with the Inquisition and Cardinal Alessandrino that the new pope initiated immediately after his election was therefore short-lived. This emerges from a letter written from Venice on 20 January 1560 by an observer with a keen interest in these events, the heterodox Guido Giannetti, to William Cecil, chancellor of the kingdom of England. He informed Cecil that the pope had expressed the intention of ordering the tribunal to concern itself with "sins belonging solely to heresy," and above all not to proceed "by means of spies or to pay attention to certain trivial matters." Giannetti also took pleasure in reporting that Cardinal Alessandrino, "under the previous pope [...] the captain and fearsome judge of the Inquisition," had asked permission to leave Rome for a few months, "since in any case he was likely to be little employed in the Inquisition." The pope, "smiling," had mockingly answered by "readily granting him leave to retire for three months and, if he pleased, forever" 85. The pontiff thus hoped to rid himself of the intrusive inquisitor and deprive him of the iron control he exercised over the Holy Office by relegating him to the provinces, to Mondovì, of which he appointed him bishop on 27 March of that year, with the implicit charge of dealing with the heretics of the Waldensian valleys instead of persecuting bishops and cardinals.

The plan took shape only a year later, although a Roman newsletter of 20 July 1561 reported that Cardinal Alessandrino would remain in Rome because no one was willing to replace him in the “office” of supreme inquisitor 86. In reality, by then Ghislieri was preparing to depart, if he had not already set out, after being forced to swallow the bitter pill of Carnesecchi’s acquittal, pronounced on 4 June 87. On 14 July, while the pope was showing “more affection to our cardinal than ever,” as Facchetto had written to Milan two days earlier 88, a brief entrusted the churches of Piedmont to Ghislieri as superintendent, “with the faculty to admonish and punish even with censures the prelates of that province in order to assist certain Catholic preachers.” Another brief, of 8 August, charged him with appointing inquisitors in the Savoyard dominions and prosecuting those suspected of heresy, duties that brought him into conflict with the duke of Savoy during his Piedmontese stay. But this was a very brief interlude: after making his entry into his diocese on 7 August 1561 and immediately leaving it for Turin, he was back in Rome before the end of the year 89.

Pius IV’s attempt, like Julius III’s before him, to curb the encroachments of the Holy Office, transfer many of its prerogatives to bishops, and rid himself of the stern inquisitor-friar whom his predecessor had raised to the purple was nevertheless destined to fail. Ghislieri certainly resented having to leave his apartment in the Vatican and move into the convent of the Minerva 90, but this did not prevent him from taking up the reins of the Holy Office again. Trials and condemnations once more raged throughout the peninsula, beginning with the bloody massacres of the Waldensians of Calabria in 1560-61 91. At the beginning of 1561, moreover, despite the grave crisis caused by Pope Carafa’s death, Cardinal Alessandrino succeeded in preventing Giovanni Grimani - who in 1552 had been forced to submit to canonical purgation - from being raised to the cardinalate 92. This confrontation between the pope and Ghislieri also became bitter. On the morning of 26 February 1561, as he was about to enter the consistory hall in which no fewer than nineteen new cardinals were to be appointed, and where it was almost certain that the patriarch of Aquileia, once again supported by Morone 93, would be among them, Pius IV himself betrayed his exasperation in answering the Venetian ambassador’s last appeals: “Holy Mary, can you not understand by now that our hands are tied?” When asked at least to reserve the patriarch’s nomination *in pectore*, he exclaimed, “Would to God the cardinals would let us do it, for we would do it gladly!” reminding him that one of the commitments assumed in the last conclave was not to make such appointments. His resigned conclusion - “if we can do it, we shall” - offered yet another demonstration of how weak papal authority had become in the face of the overwhelming power the inquisitors had managed to acquire over the preceding twenty years.

Numerous decrees issued between 1562 and 1564 nevertheless sought to redefine the Holy Office’s duties and bring it under papal control, establishing, among other things, the pope’s exclusive jurisdiction over trials involving bishops and cardinals 94. The aim was to prevent the very *plenitudo potestatis* from once again succumbing, as it had in the past, to the primacy of doctrinal orthodoxy of which the tribunal had made itself guardian. Seripando’s admission to the congregation in 1561, together with the exclusion of several faithful supporters of Paul IV such as Giovan Francesco Gambara and Scipione Rebiba, and the withdrawal of the special prerogatives Paul IV had granted Cardinal Ghislieri when appointing him *summus et perpetuus inquisitor*, were unequivocal signs of this intention. So too was support for implementing the Tridentine decree that permitted bishops to absolve secret heretics in the internal forum - a decree fiercely opposed by the Holy Office and, not coincidentally, revoked by the Dominican cardinal once he became Pope Pius V. Especially significant was the *motu proprio* reducing the membership of the supreme tribunal of faith to eight and establishing new rules for consultors and internal procedure intended to guarantee more collegial leadership and thus undermine the absolute authority hitherto exercised by Cardinal Alessandrino 95. These measures are explained not only by differing approaches to the struggle against heresy but also as the consequence of a broader political conflict involving the whole course of action Pope Pius IV, now freed from the conciliar enterprise, sought to pursue at the European level.

As has been observed, those years witnessed “the last genuine attempt by the papacy to pursue a great-power policy in an anti-Spanish key,” which after the hereditary division of the Habsburg dominions necessarily had to rely on the imperial branch 96. This required looking at Germany in a spirit of moderation and readiness for compromise, and addressing the question of the chalice for the laity and clerical celibacy

not on the impassable terrain of doctrine but through pastoral dispensations, on the premise that “if one must sin, it is better to sin against the laws of the Church than against the commandments of God” 97. Pius IV’s clash with the inquisitors must therefore be assessed in this perspective. At the consistory of 5 February 1564 they made no attempt to conceal their deep irritation with the pontiff, who, despite their open hostility toward Maximilian of Habsburg, suspected of heresy, had confirmed his election as king of the Romans 98 and normalized the Holy See’s relations with the house of Austria 99. For a very brief season, then, the possibility of an accord between Rome and Vienna reappeared, bringing the “mediators of concord” back into prominence 100, foremost among them Morone, who, though operating behind the scenes, certainly played a decisive role in this renewed conflict between papacy and Holy Office. Some members of the tribunal probably did not relish, for example, having to approve on 27 July 1566 a decree requiring a certain John Harry to obtain a certificate of Catholic faith from Morone, protector of England, thereby recognizing the cardinal’s full orthodoxy 101.

Already in the immediate aftermath of Pius IV’s election, the Milanese cardinal had become involved in an initiative of Don Ippolito Chizzola 102, who, with the ambiguous backing of Cosimo de’ Medici, had written a *Discorso* arguing for the need to “attack Germany, that is, the heretics,” and prevent Maximilian of Habsburg’s succession 103. According to Chizzola, it was Morone himself - “for a long time my patron and a man of great authority with Our Lord,” as he wrote 104 - who in July 1560 secured discussion of his “enterprise” in the congregation on Church reform and obtained him a papal audience, only then to fail to fulfill his promise to deliver to Pius IV the *Discorso*, which in substance urged the Holy See toward a direct confrontation with the emperor and his heir. It is difficult to understand why Morone allowed himself to become involved in an initiative so flagrantly at odds both with his old and firm ties to the house of Austria and with his political strategy based on moderation and compromise, unless it is attributed entirely to Chizzola’s fanciful ambitions. It is therefore no surprise that the project soon fell into “great silence” 105, after perhaps once again forcing Morone to maneuver between politics and religion, papal obedience and Habsburg loyalty, the desire to restore an image of orthodoxy and his relations with a canon regular who had already been investigated and was suspected of having been his accomplice.

In reality, after the initial uncertainties, papal policy moved in a very different direction. Supported by Morone and bitterly opposed by Paul IV’s cardinals, it sought to persuade Philip II not to oppose granting the chalice to the laity in Germany; the pope, moreover, had already permitted Maximilian its private use. This was the principal cause of a rapid and growing deterioration in relations between Rome and Madrid, to which many other factors also contributed, from the *cruzada* to questions of precedence. These tensions led to the withdrawal of the Spanish ambassador from the court and at times appeared to approach an open rupture 106. The papal indult sent by special briefs to certain German bishops in April 1564 was regarded as a true scandal, and still more so was the plan to permit clerical marriage in some cases. In early March of that year Pius IV wished to have a special bull approved by the consistory and published, but was forced to abandon it and content himself with sending private letters that were kept secret. Even his partial concessions, however, were judged heretical both by the Jesuits in Germany and by the Spanish ambassador, Don Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga, who was working to convince the Catholic king - as was reported in Venice on 1 December 1565 - that they would inevitably be followed by “freedom in foods, then the abolition of feast days, then the removal of images,” which would mean nothing less than “being heretics, but with the pope’s permission” 107. These were grave statements, not far removed from accusing Pius IV of heresy. It was no coincidence that in 1564 he was the intended victim of two admittedly futile conspiracies, behind which Spanish and Carafian shadows could be made out with some clarity 108. Such shadows were also stirring in Naples, where Alfonso Carafa was archbishop and his vicar Giulio Antonio Santoro, the future cardinal of Santa Severina, nursed uncontrollable anger at the forced retreat of the Holy Office. Meanwhile, the plan to establish the Spanish Inquisition in the kingdom as well, together with confiscation of the accused’s property, provoked violent aristocratic riots led by the Valdesian Giovan Francesco Alois, who would shortly be condemned to the stake together with the physician Giovanni Bernardino Gargano 109.

The very strong opposition - inquisitorial and Spanish, but also Jesuit 110 - that emerged in the consistory of 8 March 1564, against the background of growing tension with the Catholic king, finally persuaded the pope to abandon his plan to send Morone once more to the emperor with sweeping powers to negotiate an agreement on communion *sub utraque* and clerical marriage. But the moment was dramatic, with tension between papacy and Holy Office again at its height and the Milanese cardinal once more at the center of the storm. As Borromeo wrote to Zaccaria Dolfin on 11 March 1564, saying he placed "great trust in his experience and goodness," Morone's task would have been "to learn the needs of those peoples and, with his prudence, to consider what it might be expedient to do for the service of God and the salvation of those souls" 111. On this occasion some did not hesitate to recall the heresy trial instituted against him by Paul IV, while Ghislieri, after other members of the Holy Office had opposed entrusting him with the mission, coldly declared that he preferred heretics to conform to Catholic practices rather than the reverse 112. These were veiled threats against both the pope and Morone, who for his part was fully aware of the risks he would be taking. According to the Spanish ambassador at Trent, the Milanese cardinal's promises had been an impious "commerce in the sacrament," in which Christ's blood had become ready money with which to purchase the end of the council, as he wrote to King Philip in early March 113. The same charges were repeated in Rome by Alessandro Farnese, to whom the pope irritably replied that it was rather his grandfather, Paul III, who had sought "to sell the blood of Christ" and "make merchandise of it," having declared himself willing to grant such a concession "provided His Imperial Majesty sold him Piacenza" 114.

It is hardly surprising that this political and religious conflict drew the Catholic king ever closer to the inquisitorial party, now no longer dominated by Carafa and his anti-Habsburg idiosyncrasies. As suspicions and accusations of heresy once more hovered within the Sacred College and groups of cardinals met secretly with the pope's opponents, in November 1565 Morone complained on the pontiff's behalf of improper Spanish pressure and threats, accusing them of fomenting a revolt among the cardinals 115. Barely more than a year had passed since he had been celebrated as the savior of the Church for the shrewdness with which he had brought the council to a conclusion 116, and now more or less explicit accusations of heresy were again hissing around him. All this placed Morone in a particularly difficult position. Deeply attached to Ferdinand I and the chief architect of these policies, the division of the Habsburg dominions now forced him to choose between loyalties that had come into conflict, while he remained conscious that the inquisitors' eyes were fixed on him. In the end, together with the reigning pontiff, he had to execute a conspicuous retreat from the liturgical and disciplinary concessions proposed for the German clergy.

There can be no doubt that both his Tridentine legation and the leading role he assumed beside Pius IV - as we shall see - contributed decisively to the deterioration of his relations with Philip II's court. Morone owed the king's decisive intervention for his release from Castel Sant'Angelo in August 1559, but Philip would no longer include him among the Spanish candidates in subsequent conclaves 117. Energetic though it was, Pope Medici's policy of curbing the Holy Office failed to break its power, partly because his limited theological culture prevented him from engaging with religious questions on their merits. Indeed, he had "very little concern" for them 118, forcing him to delegate precisely to the friars entrenched within the tribunal. Thus, within a short time, the Inquisition recovered from the collapse it had suffered after Pope Carafa's death, although the pontiff was able to use the occasion to place some limits on its encroachments, albeit with increasing weakness as his health rapidly declined. As Cardinal Pacheco reported in Spain in April 1565, Morone himself had described Pius IV to him as very old, very lonely, and very tired, weak and afflicted 119 - words in which, Elena Bonora has observed, "the Milanese cardinal seemed to be speaking of himself as much as of the pope" 120.

3. The "Carafa Tragedy"

Pope Medici was inflexible, by contrast, in inflicting the harshest punishment on Paul IV's nephews. On 15 May 1560, in breach of an explicit undertaking in the electoral capitulations, he issued a bull granting pardon to anyone who had taken part in the riots and devastation that followed Pope Carafa's death. On 7 June he ordered the arrest of Cardinals Alfonso and Carlo Carafa, who, together with numerous relatives and

members of their households, were accused of every kind of embezzlement and theft, and above all of the political intrigues that had driven Paul IV into war to the grave detriment of the Church's interests. Carlo was also charged with heresy because of suspicions he had aroused in the past and his ambiguous relations with the elector of Brandenburg, attested by documents seized in his residence. This could only sound like a cruel mockery of his uncle, Paul IV, the inquisitor par excellence, who now himself indirectly stood accused of having entrusted the government of the Church to a heretic 121. Along with them and many of their retainers, the pope also imprisoned in Castel Sant'Angelo Giovanni Carafa, duke of Paliano, who, persisting in his brutal sense of impunity, only a few days after his uncle's death had ordered his wife's lover to be slaughtered by her brother Ferrante d'Alife 122.

Fifteen years later one of Paul IV's nephews, Antonio Carafa, marquis of Montebello and father of Cardinal Alfonso, would evoke the tragedy that had struck him, his brothers, and the whole family, bitterly confessing the blind madness they had all displayed after their uncle's election. Rome had filled with "Neapolitan vanity," and their social and political ambitions had exceeded "every bound; despising small and middling things, we aspired only to great things, and even to the greatest." Everything then had seemed possible and lawful, leading them "to persecute and imprison cardinals, Colonna barons, and others of the imperial faction, and to make exiles of those who fled our fury"; to seize their goods by force, fraud, and arrogance; to accumulate cardinalates and ecclesiastical benefices; and shamelessly to manipulate justice, never content with anything, never respecting anyone, never satisfying the bulimic greed that drove them. "The records are full of our follies," he commented, recalling the countless enemies they had made, their "spending and throwing away [...] treasure and time," without ever pausing to think "of the approaching death of the already decrepit pontiff," until the final collapse and the universal rejoicing that accompanied it 123. This was a bitter family reckoning with the Carafian papacy, not unlike the political assessment Pius IV offered in April 1565, when he recalled having "found matters in great turmoil at the beginning of his pontificate, princes and peoples hostile, the papacy exhausted and full of debts, poor and needy in every respect." Hence his accusation against his disastrous predecessor, who had thrown the world into upheaval rather than taking advantage of the very favorable situation he had inherited to promote the council and secure "concord and peace" 124.

"Few fail to rejoice at the imprisonment of the Carafas, especially the Roman people, who were so greatly wronged by them," a newsletter from Rome reported 125. Yet over the following months voices defending them and urging clemency on the pope grew increasingly numerous. "When they were imprisoned there was no one - apart from their own people - moved to pity, and now it seems everyone is moved, and moreover people speak with the greatest freedom, saying that this is far too great an outrage," Chizzola wrote to Cosimo de' Medici on 14 September 1560 126. Cardinal Rebiba, one of the four prelates to whom Paul IV had entrusted the trial of Morone, was also accused of obscure collusion in the crimes of Paul IV's nephews. On 8 February 1561, shortly before sentence was pronounced, he joined them in prison, where he would remain for a year. A clear sign of Pope Medici's intentions, the case against the Carafas was entrusted to two sworn enemies of the recently deceased pope, Girolamo Federici and Alessandro Pallantieri, who regained the offices of governor of Rome and fiscal procurator from which Paul IV had removed them; the latter had also suffered a long imprisonment at his hands. From the outset destined to end in an inevitable conviction, the inquiry took the form of a true bill of indictment and, in some eyes, an act of revenge against Pope Carafa. This helps explain the bitter resentment against Pius IV that accumulated in those months within the chambers of the Holy Office, which was also forced to yield in the prolonged struggle over the Carnesecchi case. Deaf to every criticism, every call for moderation, and every plea for mercy, the pope was determined to carry the trial against the Carafas through to the end. Politically, it was meant to sanction a restored accord with the Habsburg crowns in view also of the impending resumption of the council, and to offer a kind of symbolic reparation to the emperor and to the Catholic king, master of Italy, with whom conflicts of jurisdictional and fiscal nature would nevertheless arise in subsequent years.

The case finally ended with the sentence of 3 March 1561, condemning Carlo and Giovanni Carafa to death for lèse-majesté and treason, along with two of the latter's accomplices in the murder of his wife. Their

property was also confiscated, and the fiefs they had usurped were restored to their legitimate owners, foremost among them the duchy of Paliano, returned to Marcantonio Colonna. Alfonso Carafa, accused of having extorted from Paul IV on his deathbed a brief - of doubtful authenticity - giving him a casket of precious stones, was pardoned, Morone having also intervened on his behalf 127. He was nevertheless stripped of every office and forced to pay the enormous sum of 100,000 gold scudi in compensation. He had no choice but to retire to his diocese of Naples, where he would die still very young in 1565 128. It was said that, on learning of the capital sentence, his brother Carlo refused to speak to anyone and "does nothing but howl like an animal" 129.

In Pius IV's intentions, the dramatic downfall of that arrogant family, raised to the splendors of papal power, was to sanction the definitive repudiation of Paul IV's political and religious choices, while formally preserving his image as a vicar of Christ *foelicis recordationis* by placing all blame on the nephews. On 22 December and again on 5 January 1561, the Spanish ambassador informed King Philip that the Carafa case was moving toward their beheading 130. On 15 January it was written to Mantua that they had been "reduced to such misery [...] that they are dying of hunger, so much so that the cardinal [Carlo Carafa] has sold his tunicle; and thus they pass their lives, those who in their uncle's time were so proud and arrogant, and especially [...] the said cardinal, who behaved in the conclave as though all the other cardinals were his servants" 131. Despite intercessions from the Spanish court and many cardinals, the pontiff remained immovable, convinced that "for so many enormous crimes no place could be found for clemency, and that removing such criminals from that college could bring nothing but honor" 132. After having prevented Carlo Carafa from wearing his cardinal's robes, the executioner who entered his cell took an hour to strangle him with a sheet, so as "not to shed blood" 133. Giovanni Carafa and his two accomplices were hanged, and the following day their bodies were publicly displayed at Castel Sant'Angelo, with terrible severity, as the papal diarist recorded 134. Seripando, who had himself been raised to the purple shortly before, on 26 February, passed a very different judgment: "An unheard-of event and an example of divine justice always to be kept before one's eyes!" he noted in his diary, reiterating what he had written the previous June on hearing of their arrest: "Immortal God, avenger of iniquity!" 135.

Symbolically as well, the sensational "Carafa tragedy" 136 made the change brought by the new pontificate evident to everyone. It was immediately underscored in Onofrio Panvinio's continuation of Bartolomeo Platina's fifteenth-century *Vitae* of the supreme pontiffs, published in 1562. Although prudently declaring that "nostrum non est diudicare," the Veronese scholar passed an unequivocal judgment on Pope Carafa as "too severe, not to say cruel." Panvinio's criticism focused not only on the Neapolitan pontiff's "savage harshness," but also on his indiscriminate proceedings, his failure to recognize any distinction or spare anyone, the unpopularity and political failure of the war he had undertaken, his questionable appointments to the cardinalate, his revocation of the English legation and summons of Pole to Rome, and the trial of Morone, "whom he hated because of their profound dissimilarity" 137. The last phrase was destined to disappear from the new vernacular edition of the work published in 1568, for not everything that could be written in 1562, with the Carafas imprisoned, the inquisitors on their knees, and Morone acquitted - along with so many others - remained permissible a few years later, when the tiara was worn by the *summus et perpetuus inquisitor* Fra Michele Ghislieri, Paul IV's right-hand man in directing the Holy Office. Yet Panvinio's revisions were few and marginal, and the blunt conclusion remained unchanged: Paul IV would "without any doubt [...] have been fortunate and happy had he died in private life with the excellent opinion everyone held of him, without ever attaining the height of the pontificate, which more than anything else reveals what men are" 138.

Not everyone, naturally, approved Pius IV's attempt to steer the *navicula Petri* onto a different course by using an iron fist against the heirs and followers of his predecessor. "Some cardinals were so frightened by this punishment of the Carafas that in the greatest secrecy they were preparing to leave Rome," Francisco Vargas reported at the end of March 139. The complicity of Paul IV's most faithful supporters can moreover be glimpsed in the background of the murky conspiracy to assassinate the pope for which the young Benedetto Accolti was responsible in 1564. Although apparently inspired by his fanciful heretical

prophecies, it was not without covert support in the palaces of the Holy Office, the Spanish embassy, and Cardinal Alfonso Carafa of Naples 140. The fact remained, however, that Pius IV's fundamental estrangement from the crucial religious and theological questions dividing Europe, his slight moral fiber, his desire to use the tiara also to consolidate his family's fortunes, and his thoroughly Renaissance taste for leaving an imperishable mark of his reign on the papal city all undermined his ability to confront with a genuine reforming program the "great disorders in which Christendom finds itself," described by Mocenigo at the beginning of his report of 1560. Those pages emphasized the collapse of papal authority throughout northern Europe - in Germany, Poland, and England - and the new centers of heresy in France and Spain, "so that it can be seen that this spiritual power of the pontiff has been so greatly diminished that, unless the affairs of religion are set in a better state by the sole means of a council convoked by the will of all the princes, there is solid reason to fear very great evil" 141. Three years later another Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Soranzo, used similar language in depicting the nearly desperate condition of the Catholic Church. It seemed not only to him to be "advancing with such great strides toward ruin," but also to authoritative prelates such as the cardinal of Carpi, then dean of the Sacred College, who revealed that during a recent illness he had prayed for the grace to die "so as not to have occasion to see the obsequies and funeral of Rome," and Morone himself, who on the eve of his final conciliar legation told him that "he was going to a desperate cure, and that *nulla spes erat* for the Catholic religion" 142.

Only courtly rhetoric could induce Aurelio Porcelaga, a papal chamberlain, to address Vincenzo Gonzaga, brother of the cardinal of Mantua, on 25 October 1561 with a letter presenting the papal city under the sign of an idyllic *aurea aetas*, thanks to "the valor and goodness of Our Lord Pius IV, truly Pius not only in name but in nature, intention, and deeds, most pious, as one who at the proper places and times joins justice to piety and preserves mercy within justice, as an excellent and most holy prince should." From the day of his election he had labored to ensure that "four or five things in particular should flourish at all times under his pontificate, namely religion, peace, justice, virtue, and abundance." The hard times of war seemed forgotten in Rome, where prosperity and social peace reigned, where men of letters and artists were "kindly regarded and received and courteously treated," where the pope's nephews seemed "a portrait, indeed the very idea, of humanity, courtesy, benevolence, and clemency," and where the pontiff devoted all his energies to preparing the imminent council 143. In reality, matters stood somewhat differently in a Roman curia called upon to reckon with the profound historical transformations occurring at the turn of the 1550s and 1560s, transformations that also involved Morone.

These changes also affected cultural, literary, and artistic expression, though this is not the place to dwell on them. They may perhaps be symbolically summarized by the fact that definitive papal approval of the conciliar decrees and publication of the Tridentine Index occurred in 1564, the year in which John Calvin and Bernardino Ochino died, while Galileo Galilei and William Shakespeare were born. On 18 February of that year the ninety-year-old Michelangelo Buonarroti also died in Rome. In the 1540s Vittoria Colonna had initiated him into the doctrines of the spirituali, involving him in a religious crisis whose traces survive in the last frescoes of the Pauline Chapel, the tormented Pietàs, and the anguished sonnets of his old age 144. Less than a month earlier, on 21 January, the commission established at the end of 1563 by Pius IV to implement the conciliar decrees, and presided over by Morone, had decreed that the nudes in the Sistine Last Judgment be censored, entrusting the work to Daniele da Volterra 145. In those years the cardinal and the supreme Tuscan artist moreover had occasions to converse and collaborate - for example, in planning the monument to Gian Giacomo Medici in Milan Cathedral, commissioned by Pius IV from Leone Leoni as a seal of the presence of the Medici of Marignano in the Ambrosian cathedral. The stylistic decisions concerning the work were made by the pope in close dialogue with Morone - who, together with Gabrio Serbelloni, agreed its price at 7,800 scudi - and with Michelangelo himself, who described Leoni's working method to the cardinal after probably declining the commission to execute the monument personally 146.

Before dying, Michelangelo ordered the unfinished works, drawings, and sketches accumulated in his studio at Macel de' Corvi to be burned, preserving only "four pieces of cartoons," as appears from a letter of Daniele da Volterra to Giorgio Vasari of 17 March. He reported that the pope had immediately sent a notary

to inventory them and hide them “in a place where it will be difficult even to see them, let alone recover them.” Outstanding among them in quality was the sketch for a work commissioned by Morone himself a decade earlier and later intended for others. It was a *Farewell of Christ from His Mother* delivered to Michelangelo’s heir Tommaso Cavalieri. The painter from Volterra promptly reminded the Milanese cardinal that “it was begun at his request,” offering to make him a copy “if it can be recovered” 147. This work, perhaps connected with the death of Vittoria Colonna on 25 February 1547, has been identified with two drawings, one preserved at Cambridge and the other at Oxford. In the second, however, scholars have preferred to see Christ appearing to the Virgin on Easter morning after the Resurrection, its rapid strokes of charcoal defining forms that seem to dissolve as in the contemporary *Rondanini Pietà* 148.

4. The End of the Imperial Party in Rome

The division of the Habsburg dominions sanctioned by Charles V’s abdication and Italy’s transition from imperial to Spanish hegemony did not, for the moment, alter the fundamentally concordant attitude of the two courts toward the Morone trial, an attitude shared by numerous cardinals connected to them, foremost among them Ercole Gonzaga 149, followed by Bertano, Madruzzo, Santa Fiora, and Truchsess. In other words, down to 1559 the substantial pro-imperial alignment within the Sacred College remained alive and active, even in the idiosyncrasies and suspicions of the irascible Neapolitan pontiff 150. But this was the final test of a group that in many respects was anything but cohesive, already in crisis in the conclave of 1549-50 and now breaking apart on the eve of the council’s final convocation, no longer corresponding to Europe’s new political and religious reality. Particularly lucid in this respect is the letter sent to the cardinal of Lorraine on 1 August 1559, only a few days before Paul IV’s death, by the French ambassador in Venice, François de Noailles. He expressed confidence about the result of the coming conclave because what he called “the mask of the Empire,” which “in the past bound many cardinals to Spanish loyalty,” had now definitively fallen 151. The new continental map redrawn by the division of the Habsburg dominions cannot of course be assessed solely in dynastic or political terms; above all, it was marked by Europe’s new religious reality. It was no accident that the Netherlands and Milan, which remained Catholic, were attached to the Spanish crown, thereby separating them from the imperial inheritance, now enclosed within that German world whose *confessio*nal pluralism had been recognized at the Diet of Augsburg in 1555 through the irenic and pro-Protestant inclinations of Ferdinand I and later Maximilian II.

The division of the Habsburg dominions and the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis also marked a decisive turning point in religious affairs, if only because the French accord made it possible to set the council in motion again. Its conclusion would remove a long-standing field of contention and conflict between the papal and Habsburg courts. At the same time, the reasons that had led Charles V in previous decades to support the spirituali were exhausted, since Philip II’s tasks no longer included confronting the *confessio*nal fractures of the German world. The outbreak of the French civil wars made the Catholic king the undisputed master of Europe, but at the same time showed the abyss that could open before princes who tolerated the spread of heresy. On 14 March 1561 the ambassador Francisco Vargas wrote to the king of his grave fears at seeing even that realm invaded by heresies, to the point of declaring himself certain that almost all the French bishops who would come to Trent would be unreliable 152. All the more so because Elizabeth’s Protestant succession in England, the triumph of Calvinism in Scotland, and the revolt of the northern Netherlands, with the interminable war that would follow, demonstrated that Protestant expansion was far from exhausted and indeed seemed to draw new energy and a new militant spirit from the Genevan Reformation 153.

Spain itself appeared threatened by the discovery of several heretical circles in Valladolid and Seville, arousing the indignation of the aged Charles V, who from the monastery at Yuste made his voice heard in demanding scrupulous vigilance and severe repression. This culminated in the *autos de fe* of 1559, which Philip himself attended after returning to Spain 154. That same year saw the appearance not only of Paul IV’s Index of Prohibited Books, but also of the Spanish Inquisition’s Index - after an edict had already established censorship in 1558 - which condemned vernacular editions of Scripture and the works of Erasmus, Luis de Granada, and Bartolomé Carranza. It was then that the latter’s interminable inquisitorial

tragedy began. Formerly a friend and collaborator of Pole at Trent and in England, he was arrested and imprisoned on 22 August 1559, the day after Morone's liberation in Rome, as though emblematically continuing his story. It is worth reading what Pietro Gelido wrote from Venice to Cosimo de' Medici on 25 September 1559 in reporting the affair 155:

> A matter worthy of the greatest consideration: that a man held until this day to be most Catholic and most holy, and as such so highly exalted, should in an instant be imprisoned as a heretic. The world will be greatly scandalized to see such things, as happened with Cardinal Morone and the bishop of Modena [Egidio Foscarari], who alone in Italy performed the office of a true pastor; and I shall also include Monsignor Carnesecchi, known everywhere as a very great good man, charitable and full of charity. Thus, if men universally known as the best Christians of this age are then persecuted as heretics, while public adulterers are the ones who persecute them, one cannot imagine what conclusions will be drawn; but all too clearly one sees what fruits proceed from such methods.

Yet less than two years earlier the Catholic king himself had desired Carranza's appointment as archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain. The paradox by which the pious Emperor Charles V had supported in Rome men and doctrines that in those same years the Holy Office prosecuted and condemned was reversed in the inquisitorial rigor with which Philip II imprisoned Carranza and repressed the heretics of Valladolid. As the studies of Ignacio Tellechea have shown, they nourished their faith by reading the *Beneficio di Christo*, the writings of Bernardino Ochino, and Juan de Valdés's *One Hundred and Ten Divine Considerations*, appropriately retranslated into Spanish 156. Hence the rapid intensification of Catholic rigorism in guiding Philip II's political choices after Pius IV's election, during the years of Trent's final convocation. At this decisive historical turning point, in short, the very frame of reference within which the political experience of Pole and the spirituali had developed ceased to exist; their religious positions had been defeated in the council's first sessions.

The effects of the vast changes sketched here were already evident in the final phase of the Council of Trent. It differed greatly from the earlier sessions not only because of the substantial absence of the major theological problems that had animated the debates of the first assembly, replaced by ecclesiological and pastoral questions, or because of the role played by the French episcopate under Charles of Lorraine, but also because of the absence of what in the past had been the imperial party, protagonist of the battle against the transfer to Bologna. Hence the decisive importance of the Spanish contingent, which as such would be sought in vain in the council's earlier convocations but in 1562-63 was able to act with united energy and an orthodox rigor that often made its relations with the imperial contingent difficult, the latter remaining committed to seeking some compromise with the Protestants. Now isolated and without prospects, despite the acquittals pronounced by Pius IV, the survivors of that experience, such as Carnesecchi and Morone, could not escape the revival of charges by the supreme tribunal of faith, more eager than ever to settle accounts with those insidious heretics who had evaded just punishment 157.

As late as September 1558, in the draft of a letter intended for his ambassador in Rome, Philip II had mentioned Morone among the candidates for the tiara in view of a conclave believed imminent, although he was still imprisoned 158. Yet already the following year, immediately after his release, the anonymous author of certain *Nove di Roma puoi la morte di Sua Santità* could declare himself certain that, because of the never-extinguished suspicions of heresy, the Milanese cardinal "will in any case have lost the papacy, although he is among the wagers" 159. The Catholic king nevertheless continued to call him his "muy caro amigo" and profess great esteem for him 160, while Morone in turn never ceased reminding the monarch of "his great devotion and most faithful service" 161. In November the Venetian ambassador in Spain reported that the Milanese cardinal figured among the Spanish candidates together with Rodolfo Pio da Carpi and Gian Angelo de' Medici 162. In reality, as Vargas had already written on 3 October, "Morone was restored to the right of active and passive voting in conclave, but because of what had happened

“nor will he be spoken of” 163. Although he included him among the pro-Spanish cardinals 164, he had no doubt that his recent trial, not yet formally concluded, prevented him from taking part “in this dance” 165.

The election of Pius IV was nevertheless a success for Philip II and Ferdinand of Habsburg (whose succession to the imperial crown the new pontiff finally recognized as early as 30 December), and naturally for Morone, who was promptly acquitted and became the pope’s chief adviser. On 12 March, the eve of the sentence’s promulgation, the Spanish ambassador confirmed that Morone was a great servant of the Catholic king, in whose name he had congratulated him 166. In the *Report from Rome* read that year in the Senate, Alvise Mocenigo could state without fear of error that “Cardinal Morone enjoys great standing and credit with the present pontiff and with a large part of the cardinals” 167. On 15 March 1561 Vargas wrote to Madrid that the Milanese prelate “is very powerful with the pope, who entrusts him with all his secrets,” to the point that no important matter failed to pass through his hands; he therefore suggested granting him every favor, even asking “that something with which he might be pleased be sent to him by the first courier.” Two days later he repeated that the pontiff had complete confidence in Morone, who was always ready to profess himself a servant of the Spanish sovereign 168. This atmosphere of almost unanimous approval, however, was not destined to last. The pope’s initiative to reconvene the council reopened political and religious problems on which the two Habsburg courts now held very different positions 169.

Pius IV’s desire to entrust the legatine cross precisely to him aroused decidedly unfavorable comments in Spain. Morone “heads the list,” Gualteruzzi wrote to Beccadelli on 2 October 1560 170, and on 23 November Michele Facchetto reported to Milan that “all Rome is saying that our cardinal will go to Trent as first legate to the council, and I have heard that the cardinal intends to do all he can not to go there, and I believe he ought to succeed” 171. Fierce resistance nevertheless arose against him not only from cardinals close to the Holy Office, but also from Spain 172, to the point that Giacomo Puteo, one of the signatories—albeit reluctantly—of his acquittal, refused to accept the legation if the Milanese cardinal were appointed to it as well 173. The matter cannot be reduced to a passing conjuncture. In fact, those very months marked an irreversible turning point in the Spanish Crown’s attitude toward Morone, whom Vargas missed no opportunity to portray in a bad light.

> Many are beginning to murmur—he wrote in cipher on 13 October 1560 174—about Morone’s appointment as legate to the council a few days ago, and they speak ill of it because, although he is a highly respectable man and has now been acquitted, it seems hardly decorous, indeed scandalous, that he should go to Trent, since he was accused and imprisoned for the reason everyone knows. Thus some people cannot reconcile themselves to it, despite the judgments favorable to him, and they speak their minds with great freedom. They are beginning to say the same of Seripando, archbishop of Salerno, who has already arrived in Rome, summoned by the pope—as is understood—to be made a cardinal and legate to the same council; for although he enjoys an excellent reputation, he bears the not inconsiderable fault of having had to retract, before all the fathers during one of the earlier sessions of the council, an erroneous opinion of his on justification. […] Therefore, if at a time when Lutheran heresy seems to be spreading, men suspected of having been tainted by it, however honorable they may be, were appointed as legates to the council convened to destroy it, they could achieve little and cause the gravest scandal.

Vargas’s harsh assessments thus overflowed from the political into the doctrinal sphere, to the point of subordinating reasons of state to scruples of orthodoxy. Nor did they concern Morone alone, but also Seripando (“they are great friends”), reviving old insinuations that in substance repeated the charges once brought by Paul IV. What matters most, however, is that Vargas’s initiative struck home and did not go unanswered by the Spanish sovereign, whose first orthodox misgivings about Morone had already appeared in a significant autograph postscript, intended to remain secret, added to the letter of 4 August 1559 in which he had ordered his ambassador at the time, Don Juan de Figueroa, to intercede with the pontiff on behalf of the still-imprisoned cardinal 175. Now, at the end of November 1560, those cautious doubts took on a very different weight, as appears from the “most secret” letter in which the Catholic king replied to Vargas’s disturbing observations. After thanking him for the sincerity and zeal he had shown, the king agreed that Morone should be excluded from the conciliar legation, although by then, given the pope’s high esteem for him, “we have found no way of making him change his mind that was not full of difficulties and inconveniences.” His ambassador in Rome nevertheless had a free hand to try, with due discretion, to avert

that unfortunate appointment. As for Seripando's elevation to the cardinalate, supported by Morone 176, that too was to be skillfully opposed, without explaining the real reasons that made it unwelcome 177.

Evidently encouraged by this reply, Vargas—who on 5 December had again insisted on the "great inconveniences and the scandal for many reasons" that would follow from sending Morone to preside over the council 178—raised the stakes still further. In his dispatch of the 22nd he gave vent to his most rancorous suspicions, mentioning not only Morone and Seripando but also Ercole Gonzaga, Reginald Pole, Ippolito Capilupi, Pietro Antonio Di Capua, Gian Matteo Giberti, Alvise Priuli, Giovanni Grimani, Vincenzo Parpaglia, Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, and Juan de Valdés 179. It is a revealing page, in which one seems to hear an echo of the indiscriminate denunciations that fifteen years earlier a man such as Bishop Grechetto had regularly sent from Trent to Rome, charging headlong against imperial cardinals, reforming bishops, suspect preachers, and spirituali of every kind 180. There is no doubt that Foscarari too might have appeared on that list. On 30 August of that year Paolo Mario—secretary to the duke of Urbino and later bishop of Cagli—had written to Cardinal Giulio Della Rovere to report that the Milanese prelate wanted him "as a companion in the affairs of the council: he was imprisoned on the same charge of heresy," he reminded him, adding that "some cardinals have written to the [Spanish] court that by now the whole college is Lutheran" 181. If Morone had hoped, through Gheri's mission to Spain, to consolidate the Catholic king's favor toward him, this correspondence instead bears witness to the complete collapse of that old relationship of trust.

Soon afterward, in January 1561, Pius IV explicitly asked Vargas what Spain's reaction would be to the official appointment of Morone and Seripando to the conciliar legation, and received a skillful, evasive answer that still preserved appearances but was perfectly clear in substance 182. At the end of the year, in the instructions for Alessandro Crivelli, sent as nuncio to Spain, he charged him "to commend Cardinal Morone's affairs in general, attesting that he is pleasing to His Holiness" 183. In any event, the Milanese prelate, "to whom everything is told" 184 and "who can do anything with the pope," succeeded in securing the red hat for Seripando, to Vargas's great alarm. The ambassador feared that the same might shortly happen with Grimani and warned the sovereign that in that case "the entire legation of the council will be his, because the cardinal of Mantua is his great friend, Seripando his creature, and Simonetta likewise, who has always depended on him" 185. These fears were well founded, since even before the council was convened the emperor's requests concerning the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests 186 would reveal the profound divergences that now divided the two branches of the Habsburg dynasty. The same questions repeatedly resurfaced during the assembly itself, over which Morone was finally appointed to preside "all at once," after the deaths of Gonzaga and Seripando, "without awaiting anyone's opinion," as Vargas wrote on 7 March 1563. He denounced what he regarded as a scandalous decision, though he advised continuing to "dissemble with him" 187—an expression destined to recur several times in the correspondence between the ambassador and the Spanish court during this period.

Thus, if Girolamo Soranzo in his *Report* of 1563 could present Morone as one of the most authoritative "Spanish" cardinals 188, this was only because he was not yet able to assess fully the deterioration of relations between the pontiff and Philip II, at the root of which in this period lay precisely the question of the council 189. The Milanese prelate's departure for Trent and his mission to Innsbruck to meet the emperor caused grave anxiety at the Spanish court, to which Vargas persistently sent his invectives against "the pope's ruinous choices" 190. That scandalous appointment legitimized every suspicion regarding his talks with Ferdinand, whose "great servant" he was notoriously said to be, and regarding the pope's intention to grant the chalice to the laity and permit the marriage of priests, as Vargas wrote anxiously on 20 May 1563 191.

Even later, the Milanese cardinal would be seen as the standard-bearer of these inadmissible concessions and the man responsible for that promise, as the new ambassador in Rome, Don Luis de Requesens, asserted on 4 March 1564 192. The rapid deterioration of Morone's image at the Spanish court would be fully confirmed by King Philip's conduct in preparation for the conclave of 1565-66 193. On its eve, the Venetian ambassador was not mistaken when, in his *Report* of 1565, he stressed the full support Morone still enjoyed from the emperor, but also stated confidently that "he is not greatly trusted by the king of Spain" 194.

Chapter Nineteen

“It Is Not Fitting for His Holiness to Impale Himself”: The Reconvening of the Council of Trent

1. “They Would Like to Adapt Reform to Customs, Not Customs to Reform”

At the time of Pius IV’s coronation, almost eight years had passed since April 1552, when the raging of yet another military clash between Habsburg and Valois had forced Julius III to suspend the council once more. After the extremely brief pontificate of Marcellus II, it was Paul IV himself, blinded by his anti-Spanish hatred, who had unleashed war against Charles V. War or no war, Pope Carafa would never under any circumstances have reconvened the Council of Trent, in which he saw only a subtle instrument for weakening the authority of the popes and with it the Church as a whole. The inquisitors—and, at least in his hopes, the armies of Catholic sovereigns—would take care of extirpating heresy. The reform of the Church, for whose accomplishment he had been elected to the papal throne, was to be handled by a commission established in the Vatican under his direct control in 1556. It achieved no significant result, partly because the pontiff concentrated almost exclusively on inquisitorial affairs 1.

By contrast, immediately after his election Pius IV announced, in a clear change of direction, his intention to summon the council and to work toward consolidating the peace among Christian princes concluded at Cateau-Cambrésis in April 1559. Hence his effort to restore good diplomatic relations with the Habsburg sovereigns, particularly Emperor Ferdinand I, whose legitimate succession he recognized as early as 30 December of that year, immediately after his own election. Papal policy therefore had two principal fronts: “the containment of the powers of Spain and of the Congregation of the Inquisition on the one hand; the reopening of positions of mediation with the Empire and the Protestant world on the other” 2. On both fronts Morone could not fail to play a leading role, quite apart from his relationship of trust with Pius IV, both because of his political authority and because of the experiences through which he had passed.

With any theological agreement now excluded after the approval of the first conciliar decrees, which had raised an impassable wall against Lutheran doctrines, the possibility of keeping dialogue open depended—besides the ever-postponed reforms of the curia—on irenic measures in disciplinary and liturgical matters, such as permitting clerical marriage and communion *sub utraque* for the laity. The latter measure, within the hoped-for recatholicization of Germany, also sought to bring back into the Church priests who had married in the preceding decades. Already during the conclave, not without provoking controversy, the pontiff had declared himself favorable to this concession, which was strongly urged by the duke of Bavaria, Ferdinand I, and later Maximilian II, and equally strongly opposed by Spain 3. It is not the task of these pages to dwell on the pope’s political and diplomatic action to resume the Council of Trent and on the difficulties he encountered 4. It is enough to note that, although peace was the indispensable premise for another meeting of the assembly, tenacious resistance remained among the intransigents, who opposed it in principle, and among the defenders of the status quo, entrenched in the simoniacal and clientelist practices of the Roman curia and aware that the council would above all have to consider the measures needed to eradicate them.

Reform continued to be discussed intensely in Rome, but it was now clear that “very few desire it, and they would like to adapt reform to customs and not customs to reform,” as Ippolito Chizzola wrote to Cosimo de’ Medici in September 1560 5.

> Nothing good will be done—he concluded—because it would be necessary to remove everything we most enjoy and introduce what everyone opposes with hands and feet in his own house. […] In the pope’s affairs alone I find so much to do that I am bewildered when I look at what is practiced on the one hand and what reason demands on the other: what, then, will it be among cardinals, bishops, princes, and subjects of every kind?

For this reason, in the judgment of Ambassador Alvise Mocenigo, the popes had never wanted the council "unless forced; indeed, one sees plainly that not only they, but the cardinals and prelates as well, abhor it, because they fear it will do great harm to their affairs and comforts" 6. Three years later, when the fathers were confronting the burning question of episcopal residence, his successor Girolamo Soranzo put his finger on the wound by stressing Rome's constant aversion to every serious work of renewal, because of "the interest of many, and of the most important," and to every attempt to subordinate papal authority to the decrees of Trent. He concluded that "the council in these times can have no other effect than that which a powerful medicine usually has on a weak and exhausted body: it does not cure it, but kills it" 7. Pius IV therefore sought to make the conciliar resumption credible through some reform measures, once again entrusting the task to a commission established in February 1560, to which Morone was appointed even before his acquittal, while some seventy bishops present in Rome were urged to reside in their dioceses 8. By September, restrictive regulations concerning benefices had already been issued, with the aim of giving substance to the new direction of papal policy. Yet even apart from this unresolved knot, many difficulties obstructed the conclusion of what Paolo Sarpi would call "the Iliad of our age" 9.

The mission of the nuncios Giovan Francesco Commendone and Zaccaria Dolfin in Germany shattered every illusion that the Lutherans intended to participate in the Council of Trent, and many Catholic princes soon joined them in refusing: wholly useless initiatives that did little honor to the pope, Francisco Vargas commented on 20 March 1561 10. The summons met with little success in Switzerland and Poland as well, and above all in France, where, in an effort to reach an agreement capable of averting civil war, Francis II and the queen mother, Catherine de' Medici, were preparing to convene a Gallican national council. This in fact took place in the Colloquy of Poissy, which foundered in September 1561 on the irreconcilable conflicts between Catholics and Huguenots 11. There was also talk of sending Morone to Ferdinand I, a proposal to which he himself declared that he was frankly opposed 12. In the hope of involving the Protestants, Ferdinand I pressed the pope not to announce a continuation but a fresh convocation of the council—which raised the question of whether the decrees approved in the earlier sessions were irrevocable—and even challenged Trent itself as the venue, matters on which the king of Spain opposed every concession to the heretics 13. After intense diplomatic preparation, the bull *Ad Ecclesiae regimen* of 29 November 1560 used ambiguous formulas in "convoking" and "continuing" the council, summoning the assembly to Trent for Easter Day, 6 April 1561 14. Although he knew that it would be impossible for an adequate number of bishops to be present by then, in February 1561 Pius IV appointed Ercole Gonzaga and Giacomo Puteo as papal legates. They were joined in March by Girolamo Seripando, Ludovico Simonetta, and Stanisław Hosjusz, who had been created cardinals for the purpose on 26 February. Other names were also mentioned, including Morone's, to Vargas's great scandal.

On 2 January 1561 the Spanish ambassador again expressed reservations about Gonzaga's appointment to preside over the assembly—not only because of his deafness, but for many other reasons—and advised the Catholic king, should Morone's name be proposed, not to accept him under any circumstances and indeed to oppose him 15. When the pope asked his opinion, Vargas managed by saying that Morone was undoubtedly "*muy honrrado y de muchas y buenas partes*," but that he might be more useful in Rome, helping the pontiff bear the burden of affairs, since the Tridentine assembly had to be directed from there, as he wrote on 28 January. In cipher, however, he added that he had gone no further because the pope reported everything to Morone, who had discreetly been made to understand the risk of losing his reputation "*si fuesse por legado a causa de su prisión y cosas passadas*" 16. Seripando's appointment likewise caused raised eyebrows, all the more because a month earlier he had been placed in the congregation responsible for the Holy Office, with the task of changing its direction, beginning with the trial of Carnesecchi, which had dragged on for more than a year and whose acquittal was finally decided on 4 June. The offices of secretary and commissioner of the council were again entrusted to Massarelli and Sanfelice, the latter having been tried for heresy under Paul IV 17. In September Puteo, whose health was poor, would be replaced by one of the pope's nephews, Marco Sittich von Altemps 18.

Morone stood beside Pius IV in preparing the resumption of the Council of Trent, which was “heating up,” to the point that he spent entire days “from morning until evening” with the pope, who finally gave him “rooms in the palace,” though for the moment they were extremely uncomfortable 19. He was even able to make his voice heard over appointments to the cardinalate, reminding the pope at the end of 1560 that it would be appropriate to summon to the Sacred College “men of good life and learning, because now there is not a cardinal fit to go as legate to the council” 20. It is significant that in those rooms he received a Spanish ambassador and, “for the space of a good hour,” the duke of Florence, or summoned the cardinalitial commission called to deliberate on a substantial five-year tithe requested by Philip II to arm fifty galleys against the Turks—the relevant bull would be carried to Spain by Filippo Gheri 21.

Eager to forestall the Gallican assembly of Poissy, the pontiff urged the legates to depart as soon as possible, and on 16 April 1561 Gonzaga and Seripando made their entry into Trent, where at that time no more than six bishops were present. Persistent political difficulties delayed the official opening of the synod until 18 January 1562, when about a hundred fathers attended, all Italian and Spanish 22. The start was slow and laborious, partly because the question whether the council was a continuation or not prevented the work from resuming at the point reached when Julius III had suspended it 23. It was therefore decided to begin with an open question, the revision of the Index, on which a Roman commission chaired by Seripando had already begun work 24. In Trent, however, the debate spread amid lively conflict to the problem of granting a safe-conduct to those who had incurred censures for violating the Index—publishers, booksellers, authors, readers—so that they might appear at Trent and seek absolution, and thus to the council’s right to remove them from inquisitorial jurisdiction. Foscarari spoke in favor, in part so that he might use the provision for several Modenese heterodox figures 25. Toward them Morone instead had to exercise great caution, as suggested by his negative reply to Foscarari’s request for help in securing Ludovico Castelvetro’s absolution. He excused himself by saying that he was “regarded as suspect in Rome, and everything he did would be interpreted in a bad light” 26. Even the then all-powerful Milanese cardinal, in short, had to watch what he said and did, avoid false steps, and guard his back against the inquisitors.

Meanwhile, the prospect of a new convocation of the council gave fresh fuel to Vergerio’s invectives. After the election of Pius IV he missed no opportunity to hurl his pamphlets against bishops, legates, and the Roman curia. Among the earliest was one directed in February 1560 against Stanisław Hosjusz in anticipation of his mission to Germany. Sweeping everything together indiscriminately, Vergerio wrote that Protestant participation would be unthinkable unless the pope stopped persecuting them and removed Cardinals Morone, Puteo, Ghislieri, and others like them from their duties as inquisitors and executioners 27. In another of the many pamphlets published in 1562, he attacked the “wretched” Milanese prelate, accusing him of having “loved the glory of the world more than the glory of God” 28. Ippolito Chizzola came to Morone’s defense, seizing the opportunity to demonstrate firm orthodoxy and controversial commitment by publishing a volume in Venice in 1562, dedicated to Carlo Borromeo. In it he avenged himself for the venom the former bishop of Capodistria had poured on him in 1552, when he recalled that Chizzola had once preached heterodox doctrines in Venice, only to pronounce “the retraction and denial of a man of spirit” after falling into the hands of the inquisitors 29. If Vergerio had written that Morone “was once one of ours,” Chizzola replied that God himself, “through a sentence pronounced by this Holy See,” had proclaimed “Cardinal Morone’s innocence after long and most diligent investigations into him.” This innocence was further attested by “his life and doctrine,” by “his actions over many years,” by the “labors he has continually endured in Germany in the service of the Apostolic Church and the Catholic faith,” and by the “doctrine he caused to be preached and taught in his churches” 30.

2. The Edition of Reginald Pole’s *De concilio*

It was during those months of waiting that Seripando decided to publish Reginald Pole’s unpublished *De concilio*. The initiative was laden with political meaning: it sought to dispel every doubt about the English cardinal’s orthodoxy and instead cast over him an aura of sanctity that would reflect upon his former friends and associates 31, particularly Morone, whom Pius IV intended to send to the imperial court with

responsibility for “resolving Germany’s religious problems” 32. The idea of the edition may have been suggested by Donato Rullo, a former member of Pole’s household who had followed him to London. In a letter from Venice dated 5 March 1560, Rullo renewed his promise to send Seripando several orations delivered by the English cardinal, “together with some other compositions of his, which I do not doubt will be seen and read more willingly by some than they would have been at another time” 33. The bishop of Salerno was touched to the quick by these words and replied with some asperity on 7 April, saying that he had already thought of approaching Morone to publish those writings, in the conviction that it was his duty “to see that the cardinal’s works came to light, in order to give blessed God thanks for the freedom in which he now finds himself” 34.

Shortly afterward, at the end of June, Seripando informed Carlo Gualteruzzi of his plan. Gualteruzzi too was then in Venice, where Alvise Priuli, custodian of Pole’s literary estate, was near death without having been able to realize his intention of publishing some of his patron’s writings. “He has already prepared some, but first wished to send them to Rome and proceed in accordance with the cardinal’s order and will,” Rullo wrote to Seripando on 21 June. An annotation on the back of the letter records that “writings of Pole” were enclosed 35. We do not know what they were, but the Roman recipient of those works was certainly Morone. To prevent their falling into hostile hands, on 6 September Pius IV appointed him to succeed Priuli as executor of the English prelate’s estate 36. A letter from Carnesecchi to Gonzaga on 19 August shows that the papers included “the little work the aforesaid cardinal composed on the subject of the council,” and that the publishing project was far from abandoned. Indeed, the protonotary reported that he had asked Filippo Gheri to inform Morone “of Seripando’s good disposition to labor over the Englishman’s books for the universal benefit and the particular satisfaction and contentment of all his friends,” and that Gheri had told him the Milanese cardinal “had already had Seripando in mind for this purpose, but, fearing that it might seem too great a burden to him in view of his age and weakness, had resolved to entrust the task to the bishop of Modena [Foscarari]” 37. Nothing came of it for the moment, but in the following months the reconvening of the council, Seripando’s elevation to the cardinalate, and his appointment to preside over the assembly revived the project of publishing several works by Pole, above all the *De concilio*.

The first notice we have is a letter of 7 July 1561 in which the conciliar legates told Borromeo that they had seen Heinrich Bullinger’s *De conciliis*, published in Basel that January and “written expressly to destroy councils,” to which it was necessary to reply. Knowing that Pole had written “some little things, I know not what, called *Quaestiunculae de concilio*,” they considered it appropriate to request them from Morone, custodian of the English cardinal’s unpublished works. Prompted by Borromeo, Morone said that he did not remember the “little work,” but after a few days he found it among his papers and had a copy made. It was immediately sent to Trent with the recommendation that it should not “fall into anyone else’s hands, nor should a copy be made before he corrects it and has it printed” 38. After receiving the booklet, on 4 August Seripando wrote directly to the Milanese cardinal, with whom he had quickly resumed cordial correspondence after the acquittal 39. He explained that Bullinger’s book had reminded him of the English cardinal’s work, which he had formerly admired “wonderfully.” He therefore proposed having it revised and then published “as a good antidote against everything that the heretics today foolishly say or write” 40. Ten days later, writing again to Morone, he also referred to another work by Pole, of which he possessed only a mutilated copy, the *Reformatio Angliae*, which he had seen in Brussels in 1555. He assured him that in revising the *De concilio* he would rely on Foscarari’s collaboration, “to whose learning and judgment,” he declared, “I attribute all that can be attributed to any living person of this age” 41.

On 18 August Foscarari himself wrote to Morone to say that he had read Pole’s text with the greatest pleasure and could say only “blessed will the Church be when it is governed by the rules taught in that book” 42. On 23 August, by return post, the Milanese cardinal informed his Neapolitan colleague that he had not yet found the *Reformatio Angliae*, and that as for the *De concilio* he was awaiting his and Gonzaga’s judgment “before giving it to the press” 43. Gonzaga too had approved the project, which all regarded as both useful and urgent in view of the effective beginning of the council’s proceedings. On 20 September 1561 Carlo Borromeo told him that the pope agreed, but first wished to speak with Morone, “so that it may

be known whether by chance he has anything to advise concerning it" 44. It is likely that the manuscript was carried to Trent by Beccadelli and Morone's nephew, the little-over-thirty-year-old Girolamo Gallarati, bishop of Sutri and Nepi 45, who left Rome for the council in August. There the archbishop of Ragusa was to help the young prelate find his way through the perilous "Tridentine jousts" 46. The same task would also be performed by the bishop of Modena, whom Gallarati himself described in a letter to his uncle on 15 January 1562 as "a most steadfast pillar in this council, upon whom grave matters of the greatest importance may rest," esteemed by all for his "learning and goodness" 47. Beccadelli too, as soon as he reached Trent, took an interest in the edition of Pole's two books, suggesting that "if there were delay in Rome, perhaps it could be sent to Venice," in which case Paolo Manuzio should be consulted 48. On 18 September Morone wrote to him that he had heard "that the book of the most reverend Pole has pleased and that it is desired that it be printed" 49.

The book's publication became linked to another project promoted by Seripando. On 8 February of that year, on the eve of the Tridentine legation, at a meeting of the congregation for the reform of the Index, he revived an idea first proposed by Cervini in the 1540s: the need to establish a printing press in Rome in the service of the Church, the papacy, and the council. On his proposal the task was entrusted to Paolo Manuzio, son and successor of the great Aldus in Venice, who moved to Rome to establish the Press of the Roman People, though it was destined for little success 50. On 6 March 1567 Pius V would appoint Morone protector of Manuzio's press, with responsibility for supplying it with a paper mill as well 51. Yet at the end of August 1570, while thanking him for what he had done, the Venetian printer would ask him to help secure permission to leave Rome 52. Once the new premises had been found and equipped, work had to be provided for the press, and the choice of its first book fell precisely on Pole's *De concilio*. "A press has been set up, beautiful, dignified, and as correct as could be desired," Carlo Borromeo wrote to the cardinal of Mantua on 27 September 1561, informing him of the pope's wish that the book appear in Rome after revision 53. Foscarari was less encouraging about Morone's proposal to publish a new edition of the Vulgate. "Your Lordship is entering upon an undertaking full of danger, with little hope of profit and without great necessity," he wrote on 25 September, setting before him the philological and controversial thicket into which they would have had to venture 54. Nothing came of it, whereas the project concerning Pole's works went forward.

Already in his letter to the Milanese cardinal of 4 August, Seripando had hoped that the volume would be printed by Manuzio and that the latter would write a brief preface, accompanied by "a summary of the life and actions of that holy man," on which Morone was to provide some information. The emphasis should fall on "the patience he showed in persecutions, by the singular gift of God, that most gentle and most patient spirit" 55. Little more than a month later, on 11 September, replying to two letters from the Milanese cardinal, Seripando reassured him that a further reading of Pole's work had confirmed it to be "full of piety, truth, and things not only rare but beyond comparison," as was the mind of its author. Though very brief, the work furnished the most effective proof of Pole's "sound doctrine," and for this reason he, Gonzaga, and Foscarari unanimously believed that, "as divine rather than human," it could testify "to the world of the innocent life and truly Christian piety of that good lord." Even the dead, he concluded in an obvious thrust at Paul IV, "must by now have recognized their error in slandering, either through little knowledge or through malice, that which they never wished—or by God's judgment never deserved—to read" 56.

That same day, very probably in agreement with Seripando, Foscarari likewise wrote to Morone about "the most beautiful book of the most reverend Monsignor Pole of blessed memory." In his judgment it was essential to publish it, "because the occasion of the council will cause it to be read generally by all, and it will serve as a foretaste that will make all his other compositions desired; once this opportunity has passed, there will be no one to read it." It would also be a kind of manifesto announcing to the Protestants that Rome intended to celebrate the council "in the manner described in this book," thus compelling them to be "either persuaded or convicted." Hence the desirability of opening the edition with a preface by the papal legates at Trent, "so that they might assure the world of the manner they intend to follow in this council," thereby giving the English cardinal's text an official imprimatur and programmatic meaning. As a learned Dominican

theologian, however, the bishop of Modena knew too well the wind blowing through the “schools” of his confrères not to know that criticism and malice would rain down upon the book 57. The wounds of inquisitorial imprisonment still burned, in short, and the conflict at the summit of the Church continued, with the inquisitorial party weakened but far from defeated. > And because now more than in any other age—Foscarari wrote—*totus mundus in maligno positus est*, on account of the new manner used by this lord, more ecclesiastical than scholastic, it might happen that many things would be interpreted in a bad sense. To remove every occasion for suspicion, it would be well if the most illustrious Monsignor Seripando, by means of a few glosses placed in the margin, removed those false interpretations; and, persuaded by Your Most Illustrious and Reverend Lordship, I am certain that he will do so. For this same reason, namely because of this most gentle manner of writing, so different from the thorny one used in the schools, it is to be feared that, if this book is submitted for censure to some scholastic—since it is the censor’s custom to interpret everything in the worst possible way—he will raise cavils about many things, even though they are most holy. Therefore, without any further censure, since these three great cardinals approve this doctrine as holy, it could be brought to light; and the sooner, the better.

An anonymous letter to Foscarari—perhaps written by Gurone Bertano, brother of the late cardinal of Fano—confirmed the orthodoxy of the *De concilio* where it dealt with justification, but advised its recipient to make small corrections and above all to insert several passages from the Tridentine decree into the text “to play safe” and close “the mouth of the Inquisition itself.” It also suggested suspending publication and keeping the work aside “to make use of it at the proper time” 58. Seripando, who on 18 September was still waiting “with the greatest desire” for Morone to send him Pole’s writings 59, did not share the idea of publishing the book with cautious marginal notes. As he explained to the bishop of Modena, “no one can satisfy cynics even if the most copious commentaries were written for them,” and “if it is printed with the authority of such distinguished cardinals, one may be sure that no one will dare interpret it in a bad sense” 60. While the Council of Trent remained inactive, “in idleness and fear,” as Foscarari put it 61, the *De concilio* was therefore sent back to Rome just as it had arrived. There Paolo Manuzio, still sensitive—as he had been in the past—to the doctrines of the spirituali 62, set to work on the introduction. It was later revised and corrected at Trent by Muzio Calini, archbishop of Zara, and by Seripando, who, after reading a first draft, urged the Venetian publisher to insist not so much on the English cardinal’s culture, belles-lettres, and “human philosophy,” as on his eventual devotion solely to “Christian” philosophy and to “the study of the holy books” 63. Gonzaga, for his part, congratulated Morone on the “most beautiful Latin” that Manuzio had given the text 64.

The Holy Office nevertheless made its voice heard, raised doubts, and mounted such tenacious opposition that the Venetian cardinal Marcantonio Da Mula would remark that, on the basis of the reservations expressed by the inquisitors, it would not have been possible to publish even the works of the Fathers of the Church. There was therefore no lack of “reefs” 65, and matters dragged on. Only at the beginning of 1562 was Manuzio able to begin printing the work, furnished with a long dedication to Pius IV. It stated, among other things, that nothing had been dearer to Pole than bringing back to the right path those who had strayed “from the most holy laws of the Church, striving to change the minds of many of them through his exhortations, his counsels, and his learning, and some even through a certain gentleness” [*nonnullos etiam lenitate quadam*]. It also recalled the many works he had left unpublished, carefully preserved by Morone, “famous for the very great services rendered to the Apostolic See and for the unwavering innocence in which he had lived” [*perpetuamque vitae innocentiam*], and which would shortly appear in print 66. In the same year the *De concilio* and the *Reformatio Angliae* were also published in Venice by Giordano Ziletti, in a pirated edition the Milanese cardinal tried to have prohibited 67, and in Dillingen by Sebaldus Mayer, confirming the timeliness of this unofficial proclamation, so to speak, of Pole’s orthodoxy.

On 24 January 1562 Morone informed Ercole Gonzaga that twenty-five copies would shortly be sent to Trent 68. They arrived on 2 February and prompted the cardinal of Mantua to request another two hundred for distribution among the conciliar fathers, “because so great a good must be spread as soon as possible through every part of Christendom, and especially here, where the universal Church is gathered” 69. This

was soon done 70. Foscarari expressed the same opinion; shortly afterward he would have to send his condolences to his patron on the death of Morone's mother, Amabilia 71. On 16 February he wrote that "it would have been well for a good number of copies of those printed works to come to the council, because they would not only be a glory to the council but of great benefit to it; for if the fathers read them, one could hope much better than one now does." Hence his suggestion that other works by Pole should also be printed, since "one cannot imagine how a greater benefit could be conferred on the world than by publishing that lord's works; and I thank God that they are in the hands of Your Most Illustrious Lordship, who I do not doubt will take this matter to heart." Yet his words also reveal that, after a first look at the book, he had been forced to recognize that Seripando's opinion had not been followed and that, on the contrary, the resistance of the inquisitors had been so strong as to lead to interventions in the text, sometimes inappropriate ones: "I have read and examined the passages corrected or altered in the work on the council by the most illustrious Monsignor Pole, and I have begun to suspect that nothing else should be printed, since it seems to me that those passages were understood very differently by the most illustrious Monsignor and by those who amended them; all the more so because I have not seen printed that beautiful oration which that lord delivered at the synod celebrated in England, in the work on reform, which ought to have accompanied this one on the council" 72. The *Reformatio Angliae* would be published shortly afterward, but such criticism helps explain why the project to print other works by the English cardinal came to a halt.

It was at Trent, in the context of this publishing project, that Beccadelli wrote his *Life of Pole* 73, later translated into Latin and expanded by Andreas Dudith 74, perhaps after being urged to do so by Seripando and Gonzaga. On 3 November 1561 the archbishop of Ragusa had already told Filippo Gheri that he had begun the biography of the English cardinal, "whose memory in this council is celebrated and held in great honor" 75. Morone appreciated the initiative, though with some apprehension, as appears from his request to read the text once it had taken shape, to prevent it from falling "into other hands" without his consent 76. Beccadelli, evidently also eager for reassurance, complied by return post, so that by 27 December the cardinal could thank him after reading part of it with great pleasure 77.

It is hardly surprising that Morone promoted the publication of the *De concilio* and the *Reformatio Angliae*, as part of a broader project for the "rehabilitation of the 'spirituali'" that also included Beccadelli's *Lives* of Contarini, Bembo, and the English cardinal 78. By exploiting his moment of strength in the curia of Pius IV to attest, with all the official authority of the conciliar assembly, Pole's orthodoxy and apologetic commitment, Morone could reverse Pope Carafa's theorem of *Moronus edoctus haereses a Polo* 79 and turn a suspicion of heresy into a guarantee of orthodoxy. It must be emphasized, however, that whereas for other figures who in many respects came from the same past—Beccadelli, Carnesecchi, Foscarari, Seripando, Gonzaga—the edition of Pole's *De concilio* was an attempt "to reassemble and propose anew a heritage of religious ideas and experiences after the stormy inquisitorial vicissitudes of the Milanese cardinal" 80, for Morone it was instead a purely defensive operation, devoid of any intention of bringing the spirituali's religious orientations and reforming demands back into play. To see his rehabilitation and the years 1560-61 as a new rise of the spirituali 81 is to ignore the depth of the turning point imposed on the history of the Church by the pontificate of Paul IV, all the more significant because it ran parallel to the political turning point imposed on European history by Charles V's abdications. It is no accident that Morone himself was among the first to grasp its importance: the most illustrious victim of the Carafa pontificate, from which he emerged physically marked as well, his hair having turned entirely white 82.

If those old companions thought they could find in Pole's irenicism an instrument with which finally—far too late—to heal the Protestant rupture and restore European religious unity through more or less ambiguous formulas of concord and strategies of compromise on disciplinary and liturgical questions, for Morone the operation was entirely political and aimed solely at preparing a defense against new inquisitorial accusations always lying in wait. It would do an injustice to his political lucidity to suppose that he imagined he could silence once and for all Cardinal Alessandrino and the zealous followers of Pope Carafa entrenched in the Holy Office, whom he had seen at work against him during his imprisonment in Castel Sant'Angelo. Precisely because he knew their iron determination, the initiative made sense only on the legal and

evidentiary plane, setting against the Inquisition the authority of the conciliar fathers, the cardinal legates, and the reigning pontiff himself, who had approved it. As will be seen, this too was only an illusion 83. Moreover, that these editions entailed no religious demand, no desire to revive the spirituality of Viterbo, and no project to draw inspiration from it for the renewal of the ecclesiastical institution and its pastoral practice is shown by the position adopted by the Milanese cardinal in those same months on the last and decisive battle for an authentic reform of the Church: the battle over the *ius divinum* of bishops' residence in their dioceses.

3. "This Blessed Residence Has Entered the Field"

From the very beginning of the council, the Spanish and imperial bishops, and later the French, sought to give vigorous impetus to Rome's faltering reforms through a series of proposals that struck not only at entrenched curial abuses but at the very prerogatives of papal authority. As Foscarari wrote to Morone on 22 December 1561, "these Spanish lords insist greatly on seeing the Church reformed, and they would like to be the ones to reform it, rather than receive a reform made by His Holiness." This made him fear "that we shall have as enemies not only the schismatics and heretics, but that even those within our very bowels will be little friendly toward us" 84. Particularly bitter was the clash over the crucial question whether the duty of residence of ordinaries—"the beginning and foundation of the entire reform of the Church," in the judgment of Beccadelli and the bishop of Brescia, Domenico Bollani—was of divine or human law: in other words, whether or not the pope had the power to grant exemptions from the rule 85. Hidden within the formula of *ius divinum*, tenaciously championed by Pedro Guerrero, archbishop of Granada 86, and by many bishops most sensitive to the need for renewal, was a model of the Church based on episcopal autonomy and freed from curial centralism. Paolo Sarpi's penetrating judgment grasped the reasons for Rome's "consternation" at the implications of the decree, which threatened to empty the papal city of prelates and deprive it "of every prerogative and preeminence" 87:

> It was plainly seen that the cardinals residing in Rome would be excluded from holding bishoprics; that the plurality of benefices would undoubtedly be prohibited; that no bishop or parish priest could hold an office in Rome; and that the pontiff would be unable to dispense in any of the aforesaid matters, which are among the principal powers he possesses. Thus papal authority would be greatly diminished.

The great Venetian Servite failed, however, to perceive the fragility of the delicate equilibrium on which the pontificate of Pius IV rested. The pope was convinced of the need to preserve papal primacy at the summit of a rigidly hierarchical Church, but without identifying it entirely with the repressive strategy of the Holy Office. Hence his consent that the conciliar assembly should conclude several delicate trials *in causa fidei*, bypassing the jurisdiction of the Roman tribunal 88, but also his rejection of the radical episcopalist demands expressed at Trent by the most determined supporters of divine right 89. On the eve of the new convocation of the council, many believed that Pius IV himself favored the *ius divinum*, to the point that Galeazzo Florimonte, for example, felt able to write to Beccadelli in August 1562 that he was certain the pope would want the council to declare residence "*de iure divinissimo*" 90. Such a declaration would help eradicate grave abuses, restore dignity to ordinaries, and reestablish their authority over exempt orders. These hopes, however, soon proved illusory within an already unstoppable historical process that made the reform of the Church coincide with the definitive defeat of conciliarism, episcopal autonomy, and the power of the Sacred College, and with the strengthening of papal authority—"because it is not fitting for His Holiness to impale himself," as Carlo Borromeo wrote to Ludovico Simonetta on 11 April 1562 in words that could scarcely have been clearer 91. Simonetta was equally clear a month later when he informed him of the firm opposition of the "ultramontane" bishops, almost all "united against the Lord and His vicar on earth" 92.

It was Beccadelli and Foscarari, together with other bishops, who submitted to Seripando a memorial on the most urgent reforming measures the council ought to adopt. An extract was made in ninety-three points 93, later reduced to twelve and presented by the legates in the general congregation of 11 March; among them was the divine sanction of the duty of residence. The discussion began on 7 April, but Foscarari had already discussed the matter with Morone. On 30 March he expressed the hope that the council would

pronounce clearly on that decisive question and that God would “inspire those who can and have authority to find a remedy for these calamities of ours, in which one sees—indeed, one can touch—the final ruin of the Church.” By now “the evil is no longer far from us, as it used to be some years ago, in the remotest parts of Germany and France, but is already in Italy; and no human power can be seen that might prevent it from breaking out everywhere,” since it was a divine punishment for human sins. On 2 April he returned to the subject: “In many there persists dissatisfaction, not to say scandal, over this blessed residence,” which in his judgment was the essential premise of a reform capable of renewing the Church’s institutional reality and pastoral practice 94.

On 30 March Girolamo Gallarati had written to his uncle to protest against the interference of Legate Simonetta and his continual emphasis on the pope’s displeasure at the mere statement *quod residentia sit de iure divino*. As a result, many bishops had “grown cold and lost heart, almost despairing that anything good will be done, since the most important point is not to be considered,” not without grave “scandal.” If the question were suppressed, it would cause “the greatest derogation from the reputation of Our Lord and from the authority and dignity of the council,” to the supreme rejoicing of the heretics, who would proclaim everywhere that councils “are not free and never do anything except what is commanded them from Rome.” “I see matters moving toward utter ruin unless vigorous help is given,” he concluded 95. A week later the young bishop again wrote, somewhat embarrassed, to Morone, giving him a lucid account of the situation after a crowded meeting of no fewer than 143 prelates in the palace of the cardinal of Mantua. The majority agreed “that the true remedy was to declare residence to be *de iure divino*,” while others seemed more sensitive to Roman pressure. For his part, he would side with “the most learned and good,” though he did not conceal his regret at witnessing such pressure, “because if this point is not determined, it will not be because it is not true, but because it will not be permitted to be discussed fully and freely” 96.

On 9 April Foscarari could finally inform Morone that “this blessed residence has entered the field, whether it be of divine or human law,” with deep divisions between supporters and opponents, joined by those who thought that “it is not expedient to speak of it” 97. The next day it fell to him, “among the others and above the others,” to speak in the congregation and explain at length and with great learning “that God’s precept bound much more strongly than that of the Church, and he proved this to be the doctrine of Saint Thomas,” as Calini wrote 98. Calini, very close to Beccadelli and Gallarati, was judged by Foscarari to be “a prelate of great learning and prudence” 99. On the 13th Foscarari informed Morone that the disagreements had produced “some altercations,” marked by “sharp words, not to say biting ones,” between the bishops of Chioggia and Capodistria, Iacopo Nacchianti and Tommaso Stella—the former once tried by the Inquisition, the latter an inquisitor 100—while Pedro Guerrero of Granada had even made explicit accusations of heresy against the opponents of the *ius divinum* 101. In the following days too there had been no lack of “invectives on one side and the other, and it may happen that many unfavorable reports concerning some proposition, either not understood or interpreted in a sense other than that in which it was uttered, will be written to Rome,” he wrote, with a veiled allusion to the criticism directed against himself 102. Shortly afterward, when the legates put to a vote whether to make a determination on the question, which was growing more heated by the day, the opponents of the *ius divinum* and those who proposed leaving every decision to the pope won a narrow majority. “Thus the matter has remained undecided,” Foscarari commented, incredulous that it should be possible to publish “a decree on the other canons while leaving this one aside—that is, to do something utterly unworthy of the council and produce a ridiculous reform.” “As though the Church’s scant reputation today still lacked this addition,” he wrote indignantly to Morone on the 20th 103. Meanwhile, on 14 April, Beccadelli too—who had come to Trent convinced that the *ius divinum* was “one of those points upon which the salvation of the Church depends” and determined to follow his conscience 104—sent Morone a letter in which he frankly set out his position. He reported that “some curialists” were saying it was not appropriate to address the problem, “because they thought it might prejudice the Roman court or themselves if it were concluded that residence was *de iure divino*.” In his view, this risked validating Protestant calumnies and attributing the council’s failure to “the pure and holy mind” of the pope. Simonetta had had the effrontery to warn him “that it was not good to pursue this matter and that it did not please Our Lord.” It was a formal warning, repeated to other eminent prelates, to which Beccadelli had replied with

dignity by asking “for the love of God that no violence be done to the Holy Spirit” and that the bishops be left free to speak according to conscience 105.

Dated from Rome on the 25th, the Milanese cardinal’s reply came quickly and was as curt in tone as it was evasive in substance. He merely stated that the pope “will always be pleased that everyone state his opinion freely and will then submit to the determination of the council, knowing that everything is governed by the Holy Spirit and that nothing can be decided except what is good” 106. Beccadelli probably read with some dismay the icy words with which his correspondent dismissed the issue, avoiding both dialogue and the “consideration” to which he had been invited. Morone was doubtless also irritated that Contarini’s former secretary had won the young nephew over to his position. This meant involving him in views very far removed from Morone’s own, now oriented toward curialism and remote from the reforming aspirations of twenty years earlier, in part so as not to leave to the inquisitors a monopoly over Roman centralism, orthodox rigor, and aversion to a council that threatened only to give voice to the protests of the episcopate, its internal divisions, and its national fragmentation. Having already perceived, during the months he had spent in Rome as Morone’s guest before coming to Trent, this knot of acute lucidity, personal fears, dramatic lived experience, curial cynicism, political foresight, and skepticism toward the great religious passions that had once animated him for a brief period, Beccadelli may now have grasped what lay, at this date, at the bottom of “Saint Patrick’s Well” 107. For the moment, therefore, he avoided returning to the subject, having understood that a storm was gathering against the advocates of the *ius divinum*, while the Tridentine discussions were degenerating into a full political conflict between reforming and pro-curial bishops, between Spaniards and Italians, and among the papal legates themselves.

Finally, on 11 May 1562, exasperated by an opposition unwilling to yield and that regarded the decree on the *ius divinum* as the primary purpose of the council, Pius IV sent Trent an order suspending the debate 108. He had even considered appointing new legates to strip Gonzaga and Seripando of their authority, not without accusing the latter of collusion with those responsible for the “disorders.” “A deep dissatisfaction has been seen in many,” Foscarari reported to Morone three days later. He was convinced that by this act “the authority of the bishops, the council, and His Beatitude will be taken away at the same time,” almost as though he did not know that nothing happened in Rome without his patron’s consent. Morone thus became, together with the pope, chiefly responsible for the discredit of a council “of little renown because it dares do nothing without first consulting the pope” 109. On 9 May, moreover, Foscarari himself had asked Morone to make known his opinion on the *ius divinum*, certain that it would be “full of good spirit and learning,” and wishing to use it “against those who perhaps do not report the facts faithfully and perhaps censure it where it deserves praise” 110.

He had probably heard something of the Milanese cardinal’s complete disagreement with his position. Simonetta had also noticed that in his conciliar interventions Foscarari praised the pope’s commitment “to reform and to the extirpation of heresies,” but never became heated in defending papal authority 111. The bishop of Capodistria, Tommaso Stella—the Todeschino, “more papal than the pope,” according to Jedin 112—made matters worse by deciding to circulate a letter in which the Milanese cardinal expressed regret that the Tridentine assembly, “setting aside so many useful, necessary, and proper matters, attends only to that which causes so many disagreements and confusions, and in such a way that it seems to have nothing more pressing than this, which, unless God lays His hand upon it, is the seedbed of the greatest ruin” 113. On the 21st Stella replied, lamenting in turn that “the house of God is burning in many places, and instead of extinguishing the fire we devote ourselves to arguing among ourselves about something which, even if it were a pious exercise, is not timely.” He hoped that Morone would not take it amiss that he had circulated the letter and promised to send him a copy of what he had written to Gallarati 114.

4. “I Perceive Little Satisfaction with You among the Great”: The Break with the Past

Meanwhile, on 14 May 1562, following the sensational papal order that in substance delegitimized both the council and the most authoritative of its legates, an increasingly impatient Morone administered a severe reprimand to Foscarari, curtly informing him of “certain accusations” made against him in Rome. The letter

is now lost, but what Ercole Gonzaga wrote to Mantua on 29 June shows that it circulated at Trent, where it gave rise to "much talk" 115. We do, however, possess the bishop of Modena's long and candid reply of the 18th, which was likewise immediately circulated among the conciliar fathers. It is a bitter, resentful response, at times vibrating with barely concealed indignation toward his former and "most singular patron," though he formally thanked him for the "most welcome" letters. He called them such, he said, "because I would deem myself impious if it were not dear to me that others should esteem me as I esteem myself; and because I regard myself as what I am, namely of no worth, I am very pleased that such should be the opinions of others." Betraying deep disappointment, he added that his only regret was that Morone, "through his very great charity," had been saddened by those charges, which bound him "infinitely" and compelled him to thank him "with all his heart." Four "accusations" had been laid against him. First, that his opinion on the *ius divinum* contradicted the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. Foscarari denied this, while admitting without prudence or reserve that he had always believed and continued to believe "that residence is *de iure divino*," as Holy Scripture clearly stated and as almost all theologians and canonists affirmed, among them Legate Simonetta himself, who had declared publicly that he had no doubt "that residence is *de iure divino*, although he judges it inexpedient that this be declared."

Foscarari preferred not to enter into the theological substance of the matter, except on the specific point of the Fourth Lateran Council, on which he dwelt at length after allowing himself the satisfaction of obliquely reproaching Morone for what, in his eyes, after the events surrounding his succession to the diocese of Modena and then the imprisonment inflicted on him by Pope Carafa, must have seemed nothing less than an unscrupulous reversal: "I know well that I have read that council many times, having had ample opportunity to do so during the pontificate of the blessed memory of Pope Paul III, when I was in Rome and was permitted to read no book but that one, and I never happened to find this in it." Even weaker was the second accusation made against him in Rome: that the sanction of the *ius divinum*, however "true, should be omitted, since it was the cause of so many difficulties and troubles." To this he replied with an impassioned praise of episcopal residence, observing among other things that if all bishops practiced it "and were as they ought to be […], the peoples would return to obedience to the Holy See and they would nourish them in observance of pontifical dignity." Indeed, according to Foscarari, that was the keystone of the reform of the Church—provided there was a genuine wish to promote it. For this very reason the contrary opinion was "not very pious and very harmful," and still worse was the claim, made by Simonetta, that although "residence was *de iure divino*, […] it should nevertheless be kept silent, because it carried with it the ruin of the papacy." Such a thesis was, to say the least, "scandalous," and indeed "one cannot imagine a proposition more heretical than this, because if this truth is contrary to the papacy, it would necessarily follow that the papacy is a fictitious thing and contrary to the word of God." It was an "intolerable blasphemy" that revealed only the impiety of whoever uttered it. Hence Foscarari's astonishment that "such opinions have been received in Rome with so much applause," he wrote, with an implicit reference to Morone's letter to Stella.

The third "complaint," charging him with having tried to persuade other bishops to cast their votes in favor of his opinion, was sheer calumny: "a ridiculous thing" and "so far from likelihood" for anyone who knew him that it was incredible Morone could suspect him of more or less clandestine "maneuvers." Such seemed to him rather "those carried out by certain cardinal legates through promises and threats, which have also produced the effect they desired, namely, they have changed many men from their votes against their consciences and made them say what their minds opposed." Everyone knew this at Trent, where "countless lies" and ignominious gossip were spreading about what was said and done in Rome, even involving Morone. One man was saying that he had heard him utter "the loftiest words" and insults against Seripando, "a cardinal of as much goodness and learning as he possesses, and a most devoted" friend of the Milanese cardinal. If such malice were believed, Morone had gone so far as to maintain that the Neapolitan prelate had always been "desirous of the ruin of the Roman court," and for that reason now posed as a strenuous advocate of the *ius divinum*. This too was Foscarari's way of expressing his profound disappointment and reproaching the man who until then had been a patron in whom he could place blind trust. As for the final "complaint," that he had offended certain bishops who had complained of him in Rome, he merely sent the written text of his conciliar vote. In conclusion, acknowledging the situation, the bishop of Modena informed

the cardinal of his “most ardent desire” to withdraw to his diocese, justifying it in bitter, cutting words that moved him from the dock to the accuser’s bench 116:

> Seeing that my patrons and lords are not satisfied that God’s will and His holy law should be declared, and since I cannot walk by any road other than this, having already reached the final act of my life—or rather the final scene—it is not right that I depart from those principles in which I was nourished. […] In Modena I might hope to do some good; in Trent, none. And besides doing no good, acquiring the displeasure of my patrons seems to me an intolerable harm. In Modena I shall perhaps be of greater use by praying to Our Lord that He turn His wrath away from us and from His holy Church, which is going to ruin and into a most horrible abyss, with no remedy in sight; and the few remedies that do appear are despised and interpreted in a bad sense.

We do not know Morone’s reply to this candid and courageous letter. A few days later Foscarari, besides sending the customary news, merely said that he could “do nothing but weep over the ruin of the Church,” again asking permission to return to Modena 117. Four days later, however, he returned to a question that burned within him, insisting on his duty to act according to conscience and on the grave risks and “horrible scandal” caused by heavy Roman interference 118. Only on the 27th did Morone find a way to reply to Foscarari’s letter—or rather his “apology”—pointing out historical and theological evidence capable of refuting his opinion, though declaring himself ready to conform “to the better and sounder determination.” Professing unchanged esteem for him, he assured him that his own letter had arisen solely from a desire not to remain a prisoner of Roman gossip. He denied ever having said anything against Seripando and advised him, with a touch of sarcasm, not to fall into the trap of the many “lies” deliberately spread abroad, as Morone himself tried to do by giving no credence, for example, to rumors that the bishop of Modena had complained of being obstructed by him in the government of the diocese 119.

Despite repeated refusals, Foscarari would continue ceaselessly in the following weeks and months to request permission to return to his church. To leave even for a few days he would have to wait a year, until April 1563, doubtless because his moral and doctrinal prestige was too great—that of an exemplary bishop, a man of vast theological learning and excellent life and morals, as Diego de Covarrubias, bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo, described him—for his withdrawal from Trent not to appear as the brutal expulsion of a prelate disobedient to Roman orders 120. Morone went so far as to write that he could not leave the council “without becoming perjured” 121. Foscarari himself admitted that his withdrawal from Trent “would have caused the greatest scandal, and he ought not to be of so little charity as to abandon the service of the universal Church because of the idle words of some,” as Calini reported on 29 June 122. A month earlier, on 25 May, Calini had drawn up a lucid and bitter assessment of the situation that had arisen at Trent 123:

> It angers me to see this opinion on residence understood so badly by many, just as the scandal born from the opposition made to so evident and manifest a truth torments me. […] I had hoped that those who have always professed themselves ready to shed their blood for the Apostolic See would not be condemned as traitors to it—for this is what they are called—when, despite every effort to understand why their faith and their work should be regarded with such suspicion, they have never been able to obtain anything beyond general words of this kind: that this was an attempt to destroy the Apostolic See, and that from this article on residence an opportunity was being sought to overturn the holy authority of canon law and the authority of the supreme pontiff, without ever hearing any specific charge.

After absorbing that bitter defeat, Foscarari continued regularly to keep the Milanese cardinal informed about what was happening at the council and to work for the reform of the Church in his interventions. Gallarati and Beccadelli, by contrast, were able to leave Trent for at least a time. On 1 June 1562 Beccadelli, in a letter to Filippo Gheri, well aware that it would be made known to the Milanese cardinal as well, again criticized Morone’s unfortunate letter to Tommaso Stella, which had “greatly displeased those who favor residence” and because it had seemed to authorize the malicious comments of those who presented it as an attack on Seripando. “So there is plenty to boil over,” he commented, denouncing the intolerable climate that had arisen at Trent, where “by now it seems that people quarrel more than they seek the truth” 124. At that date the archbishop of Ragusa had not yet received the letter Morone had sent him two days earlier to dissuade him from siding with the advocates of the *ius divinum*, emphasizing the pope’s reforming commitment. “It would be time to resolve that blessed article of residence,” Morone stated, seeking to

persuade him that Pius IV “desires that the council persevere in its dignity and authority, in good union and holy peace,” and therefore “will not take it amiss if it decides what, guided by the Holy Spirit, shall be judged most expedient.” For his own part, Morone remained convinced that, “since there are so many other dogmas to be treated, belonging to the essence of the council, it seems unworthy—besides harmful—that so much time should be lost on accessory matters neither necessary nor expedient; and God knows to what end they are urged with such insistence!” 125.

In his reply of 8 June, two days after signing a letter addressed to the pope by thirty-two bishops in defense of the right to express their ideas freely 126, Beccadelli finally brought himself to say everything he thought about the poisonous, festering question of residence, which had by then been formally postponed. In his judgment, a frank clarification had become indispensable, lest they “give an opening not, I will not say, to another heresy, but to schism and scandal even among Catholics.” The chorus of those who, in universities and from pulpits, “take occasion to bite the Roman court all the more, saying that it would rather feed courtiers with benefices carrying the cure of souls than feed the souls of the sheep,” was becoming ever louder. He deplored the fact that some twenty copies had been made of Morone’s letter to Stella, perhaps beyond its author’s intentions, so that it could be used as a club against the supporters of the *ius divinum*, who were also the most learned and virtuous prelates, at times insulted by the most fanatical curialists as “Huguenots and disturbers of the council.” He himself and Bishop Verdura 127 had been called “enemies of the pope,” as had many ultramontane prelates who spoke “in truth and as good Catholics.” The situation had become intolerable, and for this reason too he asked to be allowed to withdraw to the inhospitable Ragusa 128.

To this clear and anguished letter, however, the Milanese cardinal, increasingly worried by the turn taken by the Tridentine discussions, merely replied on 20 June 1562 that he believed Beccadelli’s opinion on residence might “be held with good intention,” but warned him “that here it is not interpreted in a good sense.” “I see and hear much,” he continued, “and I perceive little satisfaction with you among the great in this matter, and with other friends of ours, and from this I take, as you may imagine, infinite displeasure.” Such displeasure might perhaps have been bearable “if in conscience it seemed to me that they were defending something useful or necessary; but, having examined the matter carefully within myself and with other pious and learned persons, I hold that it is harmful and wholly unnecessary at present” 129. These were almost threatening tones, made more comprehensible by the difficult situation in which Morone found himself because of the “obstinacy and zeal for discord” shown by figures who had once been extremely close to him. “Although I am not responsible for the opinions of others, I do not pass without blame on their account, as Your Lordship may have heard,” he concluded, telling his correspondent that he could not “expand” as he wished: “But in saying what I can, I know well that I am understood.” This meant nothing less than that Morone suspected—or rather was certain—that his correspondence with Trent was being scrutinized by indiscreet eyes and that every word of his was being weighed by men waiting only for the moment to catch him at fault. The sights of the Holy Office, weakened though it was, were still trained upon him, and he knew it perfectly well. Perhaps for this very reason he had written the letter to Stella that had stunned his friends: a letter directed not only to the Tridentine bishops but also, and perhaps above all, to the Roman inquisitors.

Beccadelli was deeply embittered to see himself treated “as obstinate and a lover of discord.” In his calm but resentful reply of 29 June he appealed to conscience and vindicated the integrity of his conduct, without concealing profound discomfort at finding himself so disoriented at Trent that he had to regret the barbarous “rocks” of Ragusa 130. By now the divergence of positions was clear, and subsequent letters contain no further trace of the subject 131. The defeat of the *ius divinum* marked the definitive eclipse of a project for Church reform that did not proceed only from the Roman center and summit, but sought to be built and shared also from the periphery, entrusted to the pastoral commitment of a new and credible episcopate restored to its powers and duties. As had happened with Foscarari, Morone did not consent to Beccadelli’s request to withdraw from Trent. He was able to leave only between September and early November, to treat in his native Bologna the “fierce attack” that struck him on 22 August 1562 132. Upon his return, however,

the discussion of the divine institution of the episcopate reopened the question of residence, and the candid opinion he expressed brought him a “very brusque” reprimand from Filippo Gheri in the Milanese cardinal’s name for the “ill disposition” he had again shown toward the Roman curia, to the pope’s great irritation. Beccadelli replied on 26 November that to portray him as “ill disposed toward the Apostolic See” was nothing less than to accuse him “of being a heretic.” Hence his exhortation to the Milanese cardinal not to trust those who played the “affectionate friend” while in fact fanning the flames, taking advantage of “the benevolence they find in the audiences of patrons; and certainly, if they were heard less, I believe His Holiness would have less trouble from these matters” 133.

Even before receiving this letter, on 28 November the cardinal recommended that he speak in the congregations, but reminded him that his first duty was always to keep in mind, “after the service of God, the service of this Holy See.” Replying to his letters two weeks later, Morone informed him that he had “sought to justify you with Our Lord, and it has seemed to me that His Holiness has become much calmer toward you. You must not doubt that there are at times people who are too inquisitive and observant, and who gladly perform bad offices for private ends.” In reality, Morone’s words were a warning. On the one hand he assured Beccadelli that the pope was well disposed toward him and “if occasion arises, will always grant him favor and convenience”; on the other, he urged him to walk a straight path, hoping that “Your Lordship, for your part, will be so circumspect in your actions as to remove every opportunity for anyone to malign you” 134. The chapter was closed, and Beccadelli had to acknowledge it. He later resigned the archdiocese of Ragusa and withdrew from Trent in the spring of the following year, accepting the provostship of Prato and Cosimo de’ Medici’s invitation to oversee the education of his thirteen-year-old son Ferdinando, newly created a cardinal: a choice that, as Adriano Prosperi has observed, “symbolically represented the failed balance sheet of the Italian cultural elite’s commitment to the reform of the Church” 135.

Meanwhile, Morone’s Roman arrows had also struck Girolamo Gallarati. Replying to two letters on 13 June, he expressed deep regret over his conduct. If the “dearest nephew” had sought “out of zeal” to explain the reasons that led him to be “so extraordinarily fixed” in his opinion of the *ius divinum* and to side with what was by now a small minority, his cardinal uncle had finally brought himself to reply “out of zeal” as well, depicting him as one of those responsible for the bitter conflict created at Trent “over an unnecessary matter.” “It is scandal, harm, and shame, under the appearance of piety, to give occasion for the ruin of the holy Church,” he thundered, accusing the young bishop of “crass” ignorance, “subornations,” and “bad example,” to the point that he deserved “compassion, but no excuse while he perseveres in such obstinacy.” That obstinacy had induced some to the “diabolical” idea—“things they would not do even in hell”—of conspiring with the ambassadors of princes “to have this declaration made and to make them put the sickle into another man’s harvest” 136.

> I beg you to give me peace—he finally burst out—and you have already done too much, together with many friends of ours, from which I have suffered and still suffer the gravest anguish. You others seem determined to be wiser, holier, and more zealous than everyone else, while on the other hand you are held to be the most contentious and proud, not to say more cunning, than the rest. I do not speak of my own particular case, because I am not responsible for your humors, though you have given every malicious person occasion to speak and even friends occasion to doubt; and there have been those who said that from your household I have always received harm and shame.

The reference to Catalano Gallarati and the Bolognese events of 1547 shows how far Morone’s exasperation had gone toward relatives and friends who, lost in their scruples of conscience, failed to understand what the situation in Rome truly was and what risks might be run in the future. The astute Tommaso Stella also threw fuel on the fire, seeking to undermine the Milanese cardinal’s confidence in Beccadelli and Foscarari—“I would not have thought Monsignors of Ragusa and Modena capable of such obstinacy”—so that he might assume the role of Morone’s trusted man at Trent, including in the guidance of young Gallarati. Stella took pride in having written Gallarati a letter, also sent in copy to Morone, to dissuade him from his “so vehement” support for the *ius divinum*. These were not merely the imprudences of “young prelates,” but much more serious matters, since the accusers of Beccadelli and Foscarari did not hesitate to refer explicitly to old inquisitorial suspicions, as Stella made a point of telling the Milanese cardinal: “Here

there entered the field discussions of Flaminio's doctrine, of the life of suspects in Modena, and of many other things" 137. These poisonous words help explain Morone's conduct on this occasion, unexpected by many, toward his old friends and his unreserved alignment with curial positions. It is difficult to detect in that behavior any reflection of the "moderate pragmatism" said to have dictated his choices, whereas his need not to lose the pontiff's confidence is plain 138.

Wounded by his uncle's severe tirade, Gallarati replied only on 26 June, after returning from a brief stay in Padua. He reaffirmed his intention to govern himself according to Morone's directions, denied ever having maintained relations with ambassadors of any kind, and confessed his own "imperfection and worthlessness." He regretted having involuntarily exposed his uncle to the calumnies of his enemies and promised that in future he would always act according to his directions, provided this did not force him to go against conscience, "which I cannot fail to satisfy whenever the occasion is given me with modesty and Christian piety" 139. These dignified words closed a now exhausted discussion, whose final echo sounds in a letter sent by Giovan Battista Binardi to Mariano Vittori of Rieti, both former members of Pole's household in England and later in Morone's service. Without the "foundation" of the *ius divinum*, every reform would be thin and fragile, Binardi wrote from Trent on 25 July 1562, "as the experience of provisions made in the past shows all too well." He insisted on the many advantages that might have been gained, without any prejudice to papal authority 140.

In his judgment, therefore, it had been a lost opportunity, whereas for Morone it was a cause of grave embarrassment and of behavior that perhaps he himself was the first to recognize as disagreeable. Precisely as such, that behavior reflects the great lucidity with which, even during the period when he seemed all-powerful beside Pius IV, he understood the real balance of forces in the Roman curia, without imagining that his troubles with the Holy Office were water under the bridge. Struck hard and personally by the inquisitorial seizure of power in the 1550s, he was perhaps the first to draw the necessary personal, political, and religious conclusions. To many of his former friends he appeared to be another man, and they were variously surprised and embittered by what some regarded as a betrayal of their shared past and a renunciation of every serious commitment to renew the Church and its pastoral practice. For this reason, while one may agree with Jedin's judgment that Morone was "the savior of the council" 141, it is much harder to identify him as a zealous reformer, let alone as the principal architect of Tridentine reformism 142.

5. A Council "So Dismayed That in Trent It Now Seems to Be Good Friday"

The long debate over the *ius divinum* revealed a profound conflict between papacy and council—"which gives the appearance of being assembled only against the affairs of Rome," Borromeo complained 143—among the conciliar legates themselves, between the substantial contingent of Italian bishops, largely subordinate to curial orders and some even "in the pope's pay," and the ultramontanes, mostly Spanish, whose doctrinal orthodoxy rested on solid theological learning and recognized moral prestige. Their leader was the highly authoritative Pedro Guerrero, "a man who deserves to be greatly esteemed," in Muzio Calini's judgment 144. Rome entered the field with all its forces, mobilizing even Morone's unexpected thunderbolts in a decisive battle to define the powers within the ecclesiastical hierarchy. There is no doubt that the outcome of that battle would leave a profound mark on the Church of the Counter-Reformation, with the definitive affirmation of papal primacy and Roman centralism as enduring consequences of the religious crisis of the sixteenth century. Without venturing into these problems or the events of the council, for which the reader is referred to Hubert Jedin's synthesis, we shall limit ourselves here to considering Morone's role as it emerges from the dense correspondence of those months.

That "very great dissension" among the bishops and the "great disagreement" among the papal legates 145 caused a lacerating fracture within the episcopal assembly, where above all mutual confidence in contributing—even from differing positions—to the construction of a renewed Church broke down. The pope's irritation with Gonzaga and Seripando has already been mentioned, to the point that he considered replacing them with other legates. In Foscarari's judgment this would have been the decision best suited to "ruin the Church" and destroy every "hope of good that might still have existed" 146. The cardinal of

Mantua informed Rome that if he were replaced as president of the assembly, he would not hesitate to leave Trent 147. In early June there was much talk there “about the dissolution of the council,” stranded on the shoals of the *ius divinum*. Many bishops felt that they were incurring useless expense and hardship while “the churches stand […] in manifest danger of being infected by heresies.” No decree, whether doctrinal or reforming, could be approved in the session of 14 May 1562 148. The legates themselves had to point out to the pope the widespread suspicion that “the suppression of this article was done solely for the convenience of the Roman court, which wishes to continue living in its customary license without ever amending itself and without caring at all for the good government of the Church.” Any bull suspending the discussion therefore risked only giving the defenders of divine right new arguments, if not reviving the old “grievances” of conciliarism 149.

In fact, Rome had adopted several measures aimed at rooting out the gravest abuses of the Rota, the Datary, the Penitentiary—“almost annihilated,” it was written to Parma on 25 April 1562 150—the Chancery, the Apostolic Camera, and the Fabric of Saint Peter. As the pontiff wished Philip II to be informed a month later, these reforms would cost no fewer than 200,000 scudi in curial revenues 151. “I have heard that the pope is advancing the reform of his curia,” Cardinal Legate Stanisław Hosjusz wrote to Morone in January 1562 152. On 25 April Morone told Beccadelli that “here we are pursuing the most vigorous reforms, such as will cause amazement,” and on 30 May he again informed him of the “new ordinances and reforms” decreed by the pope 153. The pontiff himself told the legates on 28 April that he had virtually “destroyed and reduced almost *ad forum conscientiae tantum*” the Penitentiary, “amid great outcries and complaints from all the officials,” and was preparing to confront the knot of the Apostolic Camera and suppress “all the other abuses,” resolved to do what was expected “of a good pope, a good gentleman, and a good Christian.” He was nevertheless careful to clarify that reform did not mean “the destruction of this See, as some would wish,” and that it was therefore necessary “to proceed little by little and not do everything at once, and to consider carefully,” knowing that “there are some persons to whom one gives a hand who then wish to take the whole arm, and after the

"the whole body by the arm" 154. On 2 May Michele Facchetto informed Milan that in Rome "unceasing attention is being devoted to the reform of the Chancery, the Penitentiary, the chamberlain's office, and the Dataria. The officials cry out to heaven, but it will do them no good; the matter is serious. A congregation meets on this subject almost every day, and sometimes twice a day" 155. It is hardly surprising that Morone, then "healthy and vigorous," regularly attended these meetings, even though almost every day he also had to answer the pope's summons and "go to the Palace" 156.

The ninety-five reform articles sent to Trent seemed "too many" to the legate Simonetta, who decided not to publish them, "so as to use them at the proper time." Thus he wrote on 11 May, while two days later Pius IV informed the legates that "our reforms here are in large part completed; the rest will be carried out within eight days" 157. After so many postponements and disappointments, however, it was difficult to persuade the conciliar opposition gathered around the Spanish episcopate, especially at a moment when passions were inflamed by the question of *ius divinum*. The decree on it had to be postponed amid widespread murmuring that the legates knew how to do nothing "but grant extensions, always giving both friends and enemies something to talk about," as Seripando wrote to Borromeo on 26 July 158. Shortly afterward Rome made known that the pope had finally decided to allow the matter to be discussed again, while fully aware "that due consideration would be given to safeguarding the primacy of Peter" 159. In the presidents' judgment, however, any agreement among the bishops on that explosive issue had by then become impossible, and the only solution was to leave the final decision to the pope, as he himself urged, although they knew that some bishops "would sooner let themselves die than ever consent to it" 160. Defeated and humiliated by Simonetta's overbearing curialism, the majority *ius divinum* party concluded that every prospect of genuine reform of the Church had vanished, and with it the very meaning of a council now reduced to a "farce" 161, from which "nothing good can be hoped," as Foscarari wrote to Morone on 25 May 162.

Further complicating matters and deepening the crisis into which the Council of Trent seemed to be sinking were the unresolved questions of the papal legates' exclusive right to set the agenda and whether the assembly was a continuation of its earlier convocations. The issue was urgently revived both by the emperor, who threatened to withdraw the German episcopate, and by the imminent arrival of the French delegation, which described the previous meetings as "a council in appearance only" 163. New clouds gathered over the assembly in June 1562 with the opening of debate on the Mass as sacrifice and hence on the Eucharistic sacrament, with its burning implications for granting the chalice to the laity. These threatened to crush papal authority between the opposing demands of Vienna and Valladolid and their predictable repercussions at the council 164. At the session of 16 July, the decree was postponed until the next session, set for 17 September 165.

Beginning on 28 August, the debate dragged on through endless speeches by theologians who, "once they begin to speak, can never find an end to their disputes, often irrelevant," Muzio Calini complained. On 3 September 1562 he said he was convinced that "we shall have to drink that chalice in any case," while hoping that the concession really would bring flocks of heretics back into the Catholic fold, as its advocates claimed 166. Foscarari declared himself in favor 167, while Seripando felt he had entered a true "labyrinth, which every day is becoming more inextricable and dangerous." He did not refrain from polemicizing against those whom he ironically called the "abstainers," so hostile to wine that they wanted to deprive of it "so many nations" that used it 168. Gonzaga, meanwhile, complained that he had been subjected to improper accusations by the inquisitors, who were thus able to make their decisive influence felt even at Trent 169. "Perhaps no matter has ever been treated in a council on which there was a greater diversity of opinions, or on which more time was spent with less fruit," the legates wrote 170. In this case too, internal divisions prevented any solution. At the general congregation of 17 September, the assembly once again decided to refer the matter to the pope, "although with the opposition of many" 171. The succession of postponements and referrals showed ever more clearly the council's impotence in confronting the most important issues. It was paralyzed by its constant conflict with the Roman curia, which in turn watched with growing concern as the work of an assembly it wanted dissolved as soon as possible dragged on 172.

In the battle against *ius divinum*, Morone could count at Trent on the support of the Jesuits, for whom he would "have shed his own blood," as he told Laínez 173. At the meeting of 20 October 1562, confirming that the Society intended to continue fighting in defense of papal power, Laínez formally stated his opposition to the *ius divinum* thesis, arguing that "the jurisdiction of bishops did not derive from their office but was granted to them by the papacy" 174. The following June he again defended the prerogatives of the apostolic see in connection with episcopal residence, linking it to reform *in capite* and denying the council's right to proceed in that direction. His vote caused an uproar, earning him accusations of servility toward Pius IV and Borromeo and malicious comments from the Spanish bishops, who charged that he had spoken on instructions from the legates 175. It is not possible here to follow in detail the Jesuits' contribution to the debates of the council's final phase, except to emphasize that at crucial stages Laínez worked from Rome with Polanco, Nadal, and Canisius. They in turn acted as skillful mediators among Morone, the council fathers, and Ferdinand I, although on the concession of the chalice to the laity they distanced themselves from the Milanese cardinal and advised that the emperor be dissuaded from requesting it 176. Perhaps for this reason as well, the final convocation of Trent was important not only in consolidating the ties between Pius IV and the Society, but above all in helping to shape its identity as a solid bulwark of Roman Catholicism.

At the end of 1562, with the question of *ius divinum* still unresolved, the sacraments of orders and matrimony remained to be addressed. The former entailed the question of the divine institution of the episcopate, "the fruit of the seed of residence already sown," as the Todeschino wrote to Morone on 7 December 177; and it has already been noted that on this occasion Foscarari again became the object of Morone's rebukes. The Spanish bishops resumed their battle amid a constant succession of opposing theological formulas and attempts at mediation in search of an impossible convergence between curialists and reform-minded prelates, forcing the date of the session to be postponed several times 178. Whatever course was taken on either the doctrinal or reform decrees, the issue of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the distribution of rights and powers within it reemerged with force. The theological and canonical debate, in short, overflowed into ecclesiology. As Carlo Borromeo wrote to Ercole Gonzaga on 30 September, the pope was entirely willing to promote the boldest reforms, "not only in the affairs of his own court, in which His Holiness has used and continues to use the great rigor everyone can see, but also in matters concerning Christendom as a whole, provided that things are asked of His Holiness as a favor and that no one presumes to demand that they be done [...] by force" 179. After so many postponements, however, such promises were difficult to believe at Trent, where the imminent arrival of the French delegation led by the cardinal of Lorraine, Charles of Guise 180, suggested that the situation would grow still more complicated and that the legates would no longer be able to keep control of the assembly. Terrified and desolate at the turn events had taken, as a conclusion laden with ever greater risks receded *sine die*, Seripando now saw no solution other than transferring the council elsewhere or having the pope himself come to Trent to "calm these most turbulent storms that now hang over the holy Church" 181.

Two weeks later the French prelates entered Trent. There were only thirteen of them, plus two abbots with voting rights, although Charles IX had urged fully sixty bishops to attend the council: a small contingent, but one capable of shifting the balance of power, even though the civil wars then under way made it unthinkable to leave so many dioceses without their ordinaries 182. What frightened the legates, and even more the pope, was not their number but the nature of their predictable demands and the political weight with which they could advance them: the Gallican traditions of the French episcopate and the strengthening of the party of the so-called "ultramontanes," especially in view of the cardinal of Lorraine's great oratorical talent and personal prestige. "Reformatio, reformatio, pax, pax" were the watchwords with which he presented himself, France's primary needs, as was observed in Rome 183. This suggested that once he reached Trent he "would not speak of dogmas but of abuses," looking more toward achieving a stable religious peace at home than toward safeguarding papal authority 184. Pius IV reacted by aligning himself ever more clearly with the zealots and rejecting the compromise on the institution of the episcopate proposed by the cardinal of Lorraine. Embittered, Lorraine distanced himself from Simonetta and the canonists supported by Rome and instead joined the Spanish bishops and their reformist, anti-curial demands 185.

Morone too expressed a negative opinion in a letter to the legates, suggesting that they "set aside this unnecessary dispute, which is indeed dangerous and perhaps even scandalous, since all the fathers do not agree in the same opinion and there is so much controversy and division" 186. In the view of a moderate such as Muzio Calini, it was necessary to recognize that "the entanglements and difficulties that exist or will arise in this council will always receive very great encouragement from those who profess to be the chief defenders of the apostolic see," as he wrote on 17 December 1562. He added that "care should be taken not to exasperate people with insults, rebukes, calumnies, and threats, because men whose aim is to satisfy their conscience are not moved by such means. Rather, they become more firmly fixed in their purpose when they see and experience methods full of interests and the most worldly designs" 187. In his eyes, the pressure exerted by Rome was intolerable: it violated the council's freedom and constrained every initiative for genuine renewal. A few days later his friend Beccadelli declared himself convinced that the reform of the Church everyone expected from that assembly would ultimately amount to very little, no more than "velvet slippers" 188.

The inevitable resumption of the discussion - or rather the confrontation - over *ius divinum* began on 10 December 1562 and continued for more than a month, through a relentless succession of interminable speeches and in an increasingly tense atmosphere, in which accusations of heresy and even personal insults flew from both sides. Reporting the matter to Morone on 21 December, even the ultra-curialist Tommaso Stella felt obliged to censure certain bishops who "want to make themselves believed Catholic or devoted to this holy see by very dangerous and unseemly methods, almost threateningly seeking to obtain their opinions with noise and shouting" rather than with sacred Scripture, the testimony of the saints, and reason. The bishop of Capodistria also attacked Ercole Gonzaga, who had severely admonished these men but not those who "often bite at apostolic authority," sometimes unwitting pawns of hidden designs to assert the supremacy of the council over the pope. In his view, the revived "refrain of residence," for which he blamed the legates, aimed at nothing else 189. The conflict between Italians and Spaniards not infrequently spilled beyond the council chambers and involved guards and soldiers. In January 1563 Stella reported to Morone - still "in the good graces of His Holiness" 190 - yet another armed clash, accompanied by "great uproar" and the ringing of bells, which left five dead and about fifty wounded in the city's streets. The opposing positions had hardened into matters of principle, and the path of compromise grew ever more difficult in resolving "this entanglement," which "is the greatest we have ever had," the legates wrote on 2 January 1563 191. The cardinal of Lorraine nevertheless sought to follow that path, presenting himself as mediator between the presidency and the opposition.

To the most ardent curialists - among whom Pietro Antonio Di Capua stood out, eager to make people forget the canonical purgation to which he had been subjected under Julius III 192 - it seemed that the French cardinal wanted to assume leadership of the council. With Simonetta's support, they blocked the text of the decree proposed by a commission he chaired and approved also by Gonzaga and Seripando. Faced with new Roman vetoes, the latter two asked to be relieved of the legation, while the council now seemed trapped in a dead end, so much so that at the end of the month the session had to be postponed until 22 April. "Here one sees such a convergence of reform proposals that it is almost impossible to deal with this matter without uproar and contention, or at least in a short time," Calini wrote 193. This was what Hubert Jedin called the council's "great crisis": the opposition of Spain, the Empire, and France was being consolidated, albeit for partly different reasons; the question of episcopal authority remained unresolved; the presidency of the synod was in grave difficulty; and the Roman curia had hardened its position 194. The pope himself found a way to irritate the assembly and belie his proclaimed reforming intentions by creating the eighteen-year-old Federico Gonzaga and the thirteen-year-old Ferdinando de' Medici cardinals, and by assigning important dioceses to prelates who could never reside in them.

Meanwhile, rumors of an imminent suspension of the council grew ever more insistent. The emperor sought to respond by moving to Innsbruck and presenting a reform program, after securing at the Diet of Frankfurt recognition of the succession of his son Maximilian, elected king of the Romans. The cardinal of Lorraine did the same at Trent, emphasizing the closeness of French demands to imperial ones. Both aimed

at a renewal of the Church founded on a radical transformation of curial structures and practices, also desired by the Spanish bishops, with whom Borromeo believed secret understandings existed 195. Giving the impression that he intended "to go to France and never return" 196, on 12 February the French cardinal left for Innsbruck to meet the emperor. Following their discussions, on 3 March Ferdinand wrote two letters to the pope. In one, he urged him to abandon any plan to suspend the council, asked that the princes' ambassadors also be permitted to submit proposals, and suggested meeting him at Trent to seek agreement on the grave disputes paralyzing the assembly. In the other, he addressed the necessary reforms themselves, including compulsory episcopal residence and respect for the council's freedom 197.

There is no need to dwell on the deep irritation with which these letters were received in Rome and by the zealots at Trent. Yet precisely in those days events occurred that were as unexpected as they were important and were destined to change the situation. On 3 March Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga died, "the head and sure guide of all these actions of ours," as Seripando described him 198. "O Fortune, how you persecute me!" the pope is said to have exclaimed when the news reached him a few days later 199. Foscarari judged it a grave misfortune. Writing to Morone on 4 March, he described a council "so bewildered that Trent now seems like Good Friday: one hears nothing but sobs, lamentations, weeping, and complaints; and may it please our Lord God that this is not an omen of some further misfortune" 200. His words were nearly prophetic, for Seripando followed the cardinal of Mantua to the grave two weeks later.

The general congregations were suspended. As early as 10 March, Borromeo announced from Rome the appointment of two new legates to replace Gonzaga and Altemps: Giovanni Morone and the former Venetian ambassador in Rome, Bernardo Navagero, who were to leave for Trent within eight days 201. On 17 March, informing the nuncio in Vienna, Zaccaria Dolfin, Carlo Borromeo declared himself certain that the appointment of the Milanese cardinal would please Ferdinand I, to whom Morone was bound by an old friendship. He was therefore the person best suited to resolve their differences, find a way out of the conciliar impasse, dissolve the dangerous anti-Roman convergence that had formed among the Empire, France, and Spain, and give a strong signal of a new course in papal policy, moving "from the defensive [...] to the offensive" 202. By sending him to Trent as a kind of plenipotentiary, Pius IV was seizing the initiative and escaping the dead end into which he had been led by attaching himself to Simonetta's intransigent canonistic position and viewing every cautious opening by Gonzaga and Seripando with concern, if not open hostility.

On 7 March 1563 Francisco Vargas wrote that many had been astonished by these choices, and especially by Morone's, in view of what had happened in the past and because "the stain of his imprisonment has not yet dried." With these cutting words he expressed his certainty that the decision would provoke harsh comment: the more honorable a man the Milanese cardinal was, he added, the more he ought to withdraw and avoid becoming the object of gossip, since this legation did nothing for either his own reputation or the pope's 203. Still more so because shortly afterward, on 16 March, before Morone had even set out for Trent, Vargas claimed to have learned that Pius IV had placed him in the congregation of the Holy Office. "Nothing else was lacking," he burst out, emphasizing that, added to the legation, the news had caused "terrible scandal" 204. There is no independent confirmation of this report, however, and it may reflect only an initiative of the pope that was later withdrawn, evidently because of the Holy Office's fierce opposition. Morone does not in fact appear to have belonged to the congregation at that time 205. Vargas was soon replaced by Don Luis de Requesens y Zúñiga, whose instructions from Philip II ordered him, on arriving in Rome, to pay his respects to Morone, deliver the king's letter, and remind him of the sovereign's desire to reward him, expressing regret that in the past it had not been possible to do so as he wished but assuring him that the opportunity would not be lacking in the future 206. It was probably then that the embassy secretary, the Aragonese man of letters Juan de Verzosa, celebrated Morone's Tridentine legation in verse: "who with lofty mind and great spirit accomplished a work that shall never die with time" 207. For his part, apparently conscious of the mounting criticism, Morone tried to avoid the appointment, which he ultimately accepted only "out of obedience" to an order from Pius IV. Summoning him to the Palace on the morning of 9 March, the pope "showed him many marks of affection and told him that he wanted him to go to Trent as legate." The cardinal's "many reasons" availed nothing. The pope finally silenced him by saying "that the Holy Spirit

willed it so and that His Most Reverend Lordship should resist no longer. The cardinal then replied that out of obedience he would do anything to serve the holy see" 208.

The Pasquinade writers did not fail to mock the two new Tridentine legates, both of whom limped: one in faith and the other in his feet, an allusion to the gout that tormented Navagero 209. Cardinal Antoine de Granvelle took a different view, as did the papal nuncio at the French court, Prospero Santacroce. Nor is it surprising that the imperial ambassador at Trent, Juraj Drašković, declared himself delighted by the appointment, convinced that the nearly unanimous admiration of good men for Morone's virtues and religious commitment could bring back to life a council that after the deaths of the two legates seemed *veluti extinctum* - as though extinguished 210. The cardinal of Lorraine, a key figure in the final phase of Trent, was somewhat embittered not to have received the legatine cross himself. In Rome's eyes this was plainly unthinkable: the curia would never have surrendered control of the assembly to another, least of all to someone who had tried to present himself as leader of the opposition 211. In any case, when a "desperate" Pius IV turned to the Milanese cardinal and sent him as his trusted representative to preside over a council "that once again seemed a lost cause," he made a decisive choice, for Morone saved Trent from failure, "probably being the only man capable of doing so" 212.

Chapter Twenty

"He Has Delivered the Church of God from Such Distress in Such Dangerous Times": President of the Council

1. The Meeting with the Emperor at Innsbruck

The first objective of Morone's mission, undertaken "with that mixture of political coolness and religious commitment characteristic of him" 1, was therefore to convince Ferdinand of Habsburg of the pope's good intentions 2. He could then drive a wedge between the representatives of the Most Catholic and Most Christian kings and divide the conciliar opposition over *ius divinum*. It is therefore unsurprising that his arrival was awaited "with the greatest desire" at Trent, where everything was "suspended" and no way of "making progress" could be seen on the horizon 3. After receiving the brief of appointment dated 20 March 4, three days later he set out for Bologna, where he remained for two or three days 5. He departed again on the fifth and traveled by boat to Mantua, where he was charged with representing the pope at the baptism of the duke's son 6. Before leaving Rome he asked Cardinal Otto Truchsess of Augsburg to send him his opinion on how to act in order to remedy the many ills of "afflicted Germany." Truchsess sent it on 8 April, accompanied by words of deferential respect for Morone's "very great experience, prudence, and courage," and declared himself certain that through his "skill and authority he will remove from His Imperial Majesty's heart many grievances against the council and the court of Rome." Besides the predictable suggestions that he urge the German bishops to attend the council and the princes to trust the pope's reforming commitment, unite among themselves, react, and awaken from "their coldness, sloth, and drowsiness," Truchsess also advised him to make every possible effort to establish Jesuit colleges everywhere 7.

Without stopping to celebrate the Easter rites at the abbey of San Benedetto Po, as he had at first intended, the *primus praesidens et legatus concilii* finally entered Trent on 10 April "with all the usual and customary ceremonies," in time to sing the Easter Mass 8. He took up residence in the palace formerly occupied by Ercole Gonzaga, which Filippo Gheri hurriedly equipped by purchasing "all Seripando's furnishings, namely kitchen equipment, beds, linens, bread, wine, fodder, and hay" 9. The following day he tried to convince the ambassadors who came to visit him that the reform of the curia "will be carried out, and carried out in earnest, because His Holiness desires it to be good and genuine." He reported to Rome that he had encountered "some ill-digested humor" and above all "an incredible variety of opinions," but not the "malice of spirit" he had imagined. Particularly difficult was his interview with the imperial ambassador, who pressed demands concerning episcopal residence, the chalice for the laity, and a reform about which much was said and little done 10.

In any case, everyone favored his journey to Innsbruck, which he intended to undertake as soon as possible, convinced "that there will be nothing that cannot be settled, since I seem to see in the majority some hope of settlement and concord." Rome too, however, had to do its part and not stint the indispensable financial resources. "Here we have no money either to assist prelates, to give alms, or even to dispatch a courier if necessary, [...] and so we beg you as earnestly as we can to provide for this diligently, because we cannot continue in this way," he wrote bluntly to Borromeo on 12 April 11. In his first address, delivered the following day before 166 fathers, he painted a somber picture of a Europe afflicted by wars and revolts, threatened by the Turks, and torn apart by religious divisions to which the council was called to respond. He guaranteed that the pope intended to spare no effort in combating heresies, carrying out the necessary reforms, and restoring peace as far as possible without injuring the dignity of the holy see 12. In reality, the meeting with the emperor was the last card to be played to prevent the dissolution of an assembly already paralyzed, from which many bishops were preparing to withdraw on the pretext of returning to their dioceses to celebrate the Easter festivities 13.

With Granvelle's wish that "God guide matters according to the public design" 14, Morone departed again on 16 April, without waiting for the cardinal of Lorraine to return from Venice, despite the latter's explicit

request 15. He reached Innsbruck on the twenty-first after a short but arduous journey plagued by cold and bad weather 16. Wishing to have his hands free in a crucial negotiation and to make clear to everyone that he answered for his conduct only to the pope, he declined to be accompanied by any council father. He relied solely on members of his household, especially the elderly auditor Girolamo Parisetto, an "excellent civil and canon lawyer" who had already been his close collaborator during the inquisitorial trial; another jurist, Giovan Battista Castelli, "promoter of the council" and vicar of the diocese of Bologna 17; and the theologian and philologist Mariano Vittori, who the year before had published *De sacramento confessionis* with Paolo Manuzio in Rome.

Despite his irritation at the long wait, Ferdinand went out to meet Morone and personally welcome the illustrious prelate, to whom he was bound by an old friendship. He invited him the following day to a dinner that lasted four hours 18, seizing every opportunity to honor him and display "infinite [...] affection" 19. The personal relationship with the emperor was indeed one of the primary resources of Morone's mission. Its first aim was to prevent the political alliance with the French contingent led by the cardinal of Lorraine that the latter's recent journey to Innsbruck suggested might be possible, which would have left the Roman curia entirely isolated. "I find in this prince the best possible will and very great devotion toward the apostolic see," he wrote to the legates from Innsbruck on 23 April 20. The talks therefore began without delay, interrupted by the drafting of documents, proposals, and counterproposals, but also by painful attacks of gout that confined the cardinal to bed for days, where the emperor sometimes visited him. They continued at a rapid pace until 12 May, when Morone set out again for Trent, watched with growing anxiety by Spanish diplomacy 21.

It was no easy matter to persuade the emperor of the rigor with which the pope intended to reform the curia as a task within his own exclusive competence, without allowing the council to presume to impose it - hence the need to avoid the formula *in capite et in membris*; to request his cooperation in accelerating the proceedings and finally dissolving the assembly; to convince him that this did not in any way constrain its freedom; to prevent every conciliarist claim, avoiding the *odiosa illa disputatio* 22 over the supremacy of the ecumenical synod over papal authority; consequently, to reaffirm that in the event of the pope's death, election of his successor belonged to the conclave; to point out that the cause of the few results achieved thus far was not alleged Roman interference but only the bitter divisions among the Tridentine fathers; to avert voting by nations, desired by the imperial party as a means of escaping the constant majority of Italian bishops; to find some solution to the problem of granting the chalice to the laity in Germany; and to preserve the formula *proponentibus legatis*, contested also by the French, Spanish, and Portuguese, who claimed that right for the ambassadors of their sovereigns as well 23. Morone considered this humiliating to the papal legates. It would be better, he wrote to Borromeo on 19 June after returning to Trent, to dissolve the council than to give "every ambassador and every bishop the power to propose whatever he wishes and say to our faces whatever he sees fit to say" 24.

The negotiations brought Morone a clear success. His willingness to compromise on lesser matters and firmness on crucial points once again demonstrated his diplomatic talent, aided by his acute perception of the emperor's weakness and desire to escape the Tridentine morass as soon as possible. Decisive in the meeting were the friendship and mutual trust Morone enjoyed with both Ferdinand I and Pius IV. Simonetta, by then bypassed in the political management of the faltering conciliar machine, nevertheless painted dire scenarios in Rome, denouncing "secret meetings" among imperial, French, and Spanish representatives 25. The day after leaving Innsbruck, on 13 May, while traveling toward the Brenner, Morone summarized the outcome of the negotiations in a brief report. He explained that he had easily disabused Ferdinand I of the belief that Rome wished to avoid every reform, that the legates obeyed the curia's orders slavishly and the bishops did the same toward the legates, and that he had succeeded in silencing advocates of conciliar supremacy, especially during a vacancy of the apostolic see.

Once "the emperor's mind had been cleared," other matters nevertheless remained: "the *proponentibus* clause, debate by nations, and reform *in capite*." It was harder to dissuade him from these because of agreements he had made with other princes. An accommodation therefore had to be found that would

convince Ferdinand "that he had been satisfied in some way, while at the same time neither the pope's nor the legates' authority was prejudiced, and the council remained in possession of its rights." The first point was accordingly "moderated" by permitting ambassadors to submit proposals either through the legates or directly if the latter failed to act 26; the second by creating preparatory commissions in which all the *nationes* were represented; and the third by assuring the emperor that every reform request he advanced would be discussed, but without using the expression *in capite* 27. As for the chalice for the laity, strongly demanded also by the duke of Bavaria and supported by the legate Stanisław Hosjusz - "so great a theologian," in Vargas's opinion 28 - Morone pledged his word and promised on the pope's behalf that after the council ended it would be granted in Germany. This did in part occur in the spring of 1564 29, preventing the issue from being buried once again or exploding into a new schism. In reality these were only verbal commitments, like Ferdinand's promise that "if the pope should die, he would not permit a new election to be discussed at the council, but would have the entire matter referred to the college." They were nevertheless guaranteed by the common intention to honor them. The pope was extremely pleased in Rome, rejoicing that the emperor had "shown in every matter the highest goodness and religious devotion, and infinite reverence toward this holy see," as Borromeo wrote to the nuncio in Spain, Alessandro Crivelli, on 19 May 30.

During the Innsbruck negotiations Morone benefited from Jesuit support. Their cooperation with the legate had been encouraged by Pius IV himself, who on 20 March 1563 had informed Canisius as well of Morone's appointment to preside over the assembly 31. Laínez, Salmerón, and Polanco had gone to pay homage to him the day after his arrival in Trent and offer him, as they immediately informed Canisius, "our prayers and work; and he showed that he welcomed this and intended to make use of the advice that would be given him" 32. The Jesuits stationed at Trent naturally greeted with enthusiasm the news that the emperor himself had summoned Canisius to Innsbruck as theologian, "so that he might make use of his services in the matters to be discussed with the Most Illustrious Legate Morone." Hoping that the talks would proceed "as the good of the Church and divine service require," they transmitted to Canisius the three points he was to discuss directly with Morone: the still-burning clause *proponentibus legatis*; the prospect of another transfer of the council to Bologna, with the possible coronation of the emperor as had occurred with Charles V; and the course - opposed by Philip II - of bringing the council "quickly to an end." The latter seemed to the Society's leaders "very reasonable and conducive to the good of the Church," because the populations suffered from the bishops' absence and further delays would cause scandal "and endless murmuring" throughout Christendom. On 20 April Polanco confirmed to Canisius that Morone "has shown himself here, as always previously in Rome, very well disposed toward us and willing to make use of the advice of our Society." He suggested that Canisius show him great respect "both because of the office he holds as His Holiness's legate and also because of his own person, who has deserved exceedingly well of us" 33. This climate of mutual trust between the Jesuits and the legate is confirmed by a letter from Polanco to Borja dated 10 May 1563 34 and by the gratitude Morone himself expressed to Canisius at the end of the arduous mission, giving him a reward of one hundred scudi 35. Canisius's role at Innsbruck helped strengthen the already good relations between the Society and Pius IV. The pope summoned Borja, then Jesuit commissioner in Rome, and "embracing him and giving him his blessing, showed great satisfaction at what he had heard through Legate Morone concerning [Canisius's] good offices for the Church" 36.

Already on 17 May, the day after his return to Trent, "having dispatched matters excellently" 37 and reached an agreement with the emperor on the terms he desired, as Cardinal Hosjusz wrote with satisfaction to King Sigismund Augustus of Poland 38, Morone again wrote in detail about the Innsbruck accords. This was despite the painful illness that continued to afflict him, which he treated poorly with savory Brescia "sausages" sent by Giovan Francesco Stella 39. He described Ferdinand's scruples and perplexities, which had often caused him "great trouble" and made him fear "some untoward event." That none occurred was due not only to God having given the emperor "a most holy mind," but also to Morone's more concrete and prosaic ability "to discover by a sure and secret route" what was being said by the theologians in whom His Majesty often confided, and thus "through intermediaries to encourage the good and Catholic among them to defend truth and right, and with the guidance of these good men to break the boldness and designs of some others who sought to stir up trouble in the camp" 40. Where divine grace failed, in short, espionage supplied

the deficiency. Above all, it was supplemented by his lucid realism, capable of recognizing that - rightly or wrongly - "the whole world cries out that we people of Rome do not want reform," and there was therefore no reason to be surprised if the emperor believed it too. That same realism enabled him to accept that the princes' ambassadors might submit proposals at the council, since they would in any event pass through the legates, who would formulate them "in the appropriate manner." If they "insisted on some rancid matter, there would be time to appeal to their princes and, by inserting a delay, some moderation could be found." Flexibility, cunning, lucidity, and readiness to identify workable openings were placed at the service of an action made all the more effective because it rested on two simple premises: the pope would do everything possible to carry out a reform "more rigorous against himself and his own people than against anyone else," and under no circumstances would he permit "even a hair's breadth to be taken from the pontifical authority given him by God" 41.

What Morone reported to Rome was therefore an almost complete success - a wholly personal success. He himself felt compelled to apologize for having indicated the course to follow in rather peremptory terms and then acted accordingly, on his own initiative and in complete autonomy, informing Borromeo of what he was doing and would do without awaiting instructions. Rather, it was he who gave the instructions, conscious that amid that whirlwind of events, decisions, and choices he saw more clearly and farther ahead. "If I go too far," he wrote at the end of his long memorandum, "in wishing to give advice to those whom I must obey punctually, I humbly beg His Beatitude and Your Most Illustrious Lordship to forgive me, attributing it to the sincerity with which I serve him" 42. In view of the results, Pius IV was the first to rejoice. Through Borromeo he informed Morone on 19 May that "throughout his entire pontificate he has never received greater satisfaction from any minister." What remained was to bring into port "this blessed conciliar business, which now rests wholly upon your shoulders and awaits and expects from you a swift and salutary success" 43. That same day he also wrote to the nuncio in Vienna, Zaccaria Dolfin, declaring himself certain that with Morone's arrival at Trent "business will now be attended to in earnest" 44. The Milanese cardinal too expressed confidence that he would be able to bring the council to a close in a short time 45.

2. The Savior of the Council

At Trent, the prolongation of his mission was attributed to various causes and interpreted in various ways. Some even proposed the hypothesis that, having received only "the most general answers" from the emperor, he was using alleged attacks of gout as a pretext "to remain at that court without loss of dignity," as Calini wrote on 10 May 1563, no longer supplied with reliable information by Ercole Gonzaga. Three days later, however, he spoke of the great satisfaction with which the cardinal was leaving the court, only to revise his opinion again when Morone returned to Trent on 17 May: "I fear there may be no great results and that in substance His Most Illustrious Lordship has brought back nothing but fine general words; and when it comes to deeds, it will be difficult to find a way of reaching agreement" 46. Morone, for his part, waited a few days before taking control of the situation, soon earning from his colleague Hosjusz the title *praeses adamantinus* - the adamantine president 47. In any case, the agreement with Ferdinand I was only a preliminary to the task that awaited him. It was the first knot beginning to loosen in the alliance among Europe's principal sovereigns to impose on Rome reforms it was unwilling to swallow. During his absence, moreover, a Spanish ambassador had finally arrived at Trent: the count of Luna, Claudio Fernández de Quiñones, recently returned from the imperial court. His aims did not differ greatly from those of his French counterpart Louis de Lanssac and the cardinal of Lorraine, but until then he had stayed away because of the thorny question of which crown enjoyed precedence, for which a fragile compromise was now found in part through Morone's intervention 48.

This made it possible to resume the proceedings and address the last open questions: the doctrine of the sacraments of orders and matrimony. The latter was expected to be relatively straightforward, while the former was explosive, reopening the extremely delicate issues of *ius divinum* - the decree on which had been postponed - the institution of bishops and their pastoral ministry, and hence papal authority, conciliarism, and reform of the clergy 49. On 10 June the legates reported in detail to Borromeo on the "troubled state" in

which they found themselves: "We see a tendency throughout this council continually to demand reform of the court of Rome and an enlargement of the bishops' powers" 50. On the twenty-first they informed him that the princes and their representatives at Trent wanted reform of the College of Cardinals to be enacted "by the council and not by His Beatitude" 51. The heart of the problem, in short, was always power: the relationship between episcopal and papal authority, and therefore the premises and objectives of reform of the Church. "Everyone attacks us over this blessed reform," Borromeo wrote on 26 June, "and it almost seems that the blows are aimed at nothing but wounding the authority of this holy see" 52. The discussions and meetings indeed continued beyond expectations, forcing the session to be delayed until 15 July amid a constant succession of documents, proposals, and counterproposals. "We are moving very slowly, because many would rather deliver sermons and orations than state their opinions," Calini commented on 23 May 53. Almost every effort to find words and definitions capable of softening one opposition merely intensified another, forcing the presidency to seek further compromise formulas that risked creating only "a nursery of new discord for the future," as the legates wrote on 19 June. They had become convinced that "the Church of God will never enjoy peace, nor will it be free, one might almost say, from schism, unless these matters are settled once and for all" 54.

It was during those weeks, however, that the positions of the French and Spanish bishops began to diverge, although Morone had little success in trying to persuade the cardinal of Lorraine to abandon his unyielding defense of the autonomy of episcopal power from papal authority. It must also be borne in mind that the troubled fortunes of the French cardinal's house played a decisive role in shaping his conciliar choices. Its growing political power had been struck in February 1563 by the assassination of his brother François, duke of Guise, the family's military arm; news of the murder reached Trent on 8 March. It now fell to Lorraine to become head of the family and assume guardianship of his nephews while far from France, wounded in his affections and his pride, beset by enormous financial problems, and openly disliked by the queen mother Catherine de' Medici, who sought an agreement, or at least a truce, rather than confrontation with the Huguenots. Suddenly weak and isolated, "threatened in his very life" 55, he had to choose whether to find an ally in Philip II or Pope Pius IV, whose conciliar policies were diametrically opposed. It is above all in this perspective that his abandonment of frontal opposition to Rome must be understood, in favor of seeking an agreement that would allow the council to reach a rapid conclusion. Hence his increasing independence from the crown's instructions, represented at Trent by Catherine de' Medici's ambassadors Louis de Lanssac, then Jean de Morvillier, and above all the energetic Arnaud du Ferrier, until in practice he was disavowed by the crown.

Morone's agreement with the imperial party, by contrast, remained firm. On 4 June he could write to Rome that he had summoned the imperial ambassadors to seek their advice on how "to proceed with the decree on residence and the canon on the institution of bishops," the final obstacles to overcome before they could at last hope "to reach the end of this council, so greatly desired by everyone and so necessary" 56. Everything was now in the hands of the Milanese cardinal. "With your great prudence you are capable, so to speak, of adding light to the sun," Borromeo wrote to him on 27 May, emphasizing that "the more His Holiness considers the difficulties you have encountered and the schemes that had been devised against us, the more he praises and blesses Your Most Illustrious Lordship" 57. Yet bringing the council to the desired conclusion was not easy, partly because the holy see continued to urge the legates to act in ways incompatible with the political reality they had to confront at Trent. They were further hampered by slow communications: at least ten days passed between sending a dispatch and receiving an answer. "If His Holiness," the legates wrote on 14 June 1563, "could see with his own eyes the face of this council, or if we were capable by letters or spoken words of representing it to him in such a way that he could fully understand its condition, we are certain that he would have a different conception of it from the one he now has" 58. Morone's health also caused some concern. He was now fifty-five, worn down by continuous commitments, responsibilities, travel, discomfort, and fatigue; he had endured a long imprisonment and was tormented by the "podagra" he shared with almost all the great men of the earth.

In Rome, however, it was perfectly well understood that if they wished to escape the marsh and avoid "this half-disgrace of having held no session for so many months" 59, something had to change, and Morone alone was capable of bringing it about. This was due not only to his political lucidity and seasoned diplomatic experience, but also, and perhaps above all, to his personal authority and the pope's complete confidence in him. These allowed him to act with otherwise unthinkable autonomy and to take command of the conciliar assembly where it actually met, without waiting for it to be guided by the Holy Spirit enclosed in the Roman "valises," to use Paolo Sarpi's famous metaphor. In a draft dated 9 August Morone himself wished to recall "the ample freedom given us by His Beatitude to do the best we can without awaiting any further order," although he later preferred to delete the words from the final version 60. If, for example, he thought it useful to provide a prelate with money, Rome wrote that "everything you promise will be promptly carried out by Our Lord" 61. On the thorny question of precedence between the Spanish and French ambassadors, over which the cardinal of Lorraine threatened to withdraw from Trent and promote a national council, Morone assumed responsibility for the decision. Skillful too was his choice to entrust negotiation of doctrinal questions to Foscarari, despite their past disagreements precisely over *ius divinum*, knowing well the prestige Foscarari enjoyed among the bishops from beyond the Alps 62.

Still more skillful was his decision to discuss the most delicate points within a commission of notables, "prelates, generals, and theologians" 63, with the aim of presenting the plenary congregations with texts that had already obtained broad agreement among the most authoritative fathers. The legate used this method repeatedly. It was not popular with most bishops, who were in practice excluded from the council's decision-making core, but it was highly effective in removing problems from the chaos of the full assembly, discussing and proposing compromises in restricted settings, and reaching agreements from which few could withdraw. It was a pragmatic tactic which, John O'Malley has written, Morone employed simply because "it worked; he needed no other reason to use it" 64. To this commission the Milanese cardinal proposed a formula on the sacrament of orders that took no position either on the sacramental character of episcopal consecration or on the relationship between episcopal and papal authority. In this way, aided by widespread exhaustion and the awareness that another postponement would mean the council's complete failure, a general agreement was reached without victors or vanquished and with the number of opponents reduced to a minimum. Among those opponents Pietro Antonio Di Capua continued to stand out in a bitter clash with the cardinal of Lorraine 65. The agreement marked a turning point in the proceedings. On 15 July 1563, in the presence of 236 fathers, the Twenty-Third Session finally approved the decrees on the sacrament of orders 66. "All these matters passed with such concord that one may say they met with no opposition at all," Calini wrote with some amazement on the very day of the session 67.

Morone commented proudly on the "good success." Writing to Borromeo on 19 July, he said that although "everything must be acknowledged as coming from God," he had not lacked "faith and diligence so that the council might within a short time reach some good conclusion." This had been possible thanks to the support of the imperial party 68 and the French, which isolated the tenacious Spanish opposition 69. In reply, the cardinal-nephew acknowledged that after God's grace the result, previously regarded as "impossible," was due to Morone's "prudence and skill" 70. With the imminent arrival of the cardinal of Guise in view, on 4 August the former nuncio in France, Sebastiano Gualtieri, informed Morone from Rome that the pope did nothing but praise his "sincere spirit and excellent disposition" and express gratitude for the labors he was undertaking to free him from "the annoyances and troubles of this council." Pius spoke of him "in such affectionate and loving words" that Morone was entitled to ask for anything he desired 71. Even his most difficult and unyielding adversary, the Spanish ambassador Claudio de Luna, wrote to the pope on 22 July to praise the wisdom of the legates, "and above all of the great Cardinal Morone, whose indefatigable effort in guiding the assembly and unfailing wisdom in managing all affairs, Most Holy Father, you should appreciate as never before" 72. After the agreement with the emperor, the successful session was Morone's second great triumph. Strong in papal support, he succeeded in diminishing Simonetta's role. Although Simonetta's following of zealots was replenished by the arrival at Trent of many additional Italian prelates, it was increasingly reduced to bishops more papist than the pope. Hosjusz and Navagero, by contrast, were moderates, especially the former, and both held positions close to those of the emperor 73. It was therefore

Morone who steered the conciliar ship into port, as is also suggested by his assumption of the task of drafting letters to Rome and thus presenting the problems and proposing solutions.

Added to this - and it was no small matter - was the relationship of trust established with the cardinal of Lorraine, the most authoritative political representative of Gallican anti-curialism. Yet, to the great surprise of many and the equal irritation of the Spanish bishops, Lorraine suddenly seemed to retreat from his opposition and permit the decisive advance represented by the session of 15 July. This cleared away one of the most difficult questions on which the council had repeatedly risked running aground. The summer of that year, Alain Tallon has written, saw an idyll blossom between Rome and the cardinal of Lorraine, who also knew how to derive considerable benefits from it for himself and his family 74. Morone could pride himself on always having "treated him lovingly and shown him more or less favor according to his actions," claiming some credit for the fact that "now [...] he proceeds well." He never ceased urging the curia to use "every good method" toward a man on whom depended both the council's conclusion and "what little hope remains of the recovery of France" 75. Hence his suggestion that Lorraine too be appointed among the conciliar legates 76, while Rome urged him - as though there were any need - "to keep the cardinal of Lorraine sweetened by every kind of affectionate and confidential office" 77. Not a few were astonished by this sudden cordiality. It gave Calini the impression that "the affairs of this blessed council have more variety and are subject to greater change than the waves of the sea, since from one day to the next they alter their appearance" 78.

It is not easy to understand the reasons for that change, which appeared to many as a genuine "about-face" 79. Yet through it the French cardinal recovered a crucial role and made a decisive contribution to freeing the assembly from the mire of its exhausted conflicts and clearing the way toward the finish. To the solid agreement between Morone and the emperor was now added the French cardinal, perhaps flattered by the prospect of being appointed legate in France and thereby becoming master of the Gallican Church; perhaps also aware of the responsibility he would assume by continuing an opposition of principle and therefore eager to find a point of contact between "Gallican sensibility and Tridentine spirit" 80. Above all, however, he was conditioned by the tumultuous events in France, the political role of the great family to which he belonged, and his increasingly marked conflict with the crown over the Huguenot question. The result was a kind of duality in French conciliar policy: that of the crown and that of the cardinal of Lorraine. As has been perceptively observed, it was precisely in this duality that both Catherine de' Medici's subsequent refusal to accept the Tridentine decrees in her kingdom and the birth of a Catholic, Guise, and Tridentine party were rooted. This party was not yet in open conflict with the monarchy, but it was no longer aligned with its policy 81.

The common line created by Morone's confidential negotiations with the cardinal of Lorraine was all the more significant because it isolated the intransigence of the Spanish bishops. Through the count of Luna they appeared determined instead to prolong the assembly's work by discussing "indulgences, images, purgatory, and so forth, which would take a very long time and perhaps cause shame and scandal" 82. For this reason, on 20 July Morone wrote an impassioned letter to the duke of Alba. He emphasized the success of the recently concluded session, achieved in part thanks to the votes of the Spanish prelates, and announced the intention "to proceed to reform, which will be carried out in earnest, and to the remaining dogmas that have not yet been completed." He then lamented that Philip II had expressed the desire to drag out still further a council now "exhausted" and wishing only to dissolve so that the bishops might "go in peace to tend their dioceses, which are in such great need of them, as is well known, especially in Italy and France, where heresies continue to grow through the pastors' absence, to the great ruin of souls." There was also the risk that the pope or the emperor, both elderly and infirm, might suddenly die, with grave consequences, beginning with the inevitable dissolution of the synod, "which would scatter without reaching any conclusion," leaving what remained of the Catholic faith in uncertainty and giving new vigor to heresy. "Therefore, once the dogmas are completed and reform has been enacted, I cannot see how this council may be prolonged without the gravest offense to God and great scandal," he concluded 83. "This trouble from the Spaniards seems to me to be becoming worse than that from the French," he confided to Borromeo on 29

July 84, only to learn from the cardinal of Lorraine that the queen of France too was asking Trent "to determine matters concerning images, invocation of the saints, purgatory, and other similar questions" 85.

The sacrament of matrimony still had to be addressed, though it did not seem likely to provoke grave conflict. The last and long-standing question remaining on the table, however - reform of the Church, and especially of the curia - threatened dramatic storms, because the representatives of the major European powers and Rome held opposing positions. It was no accident that, in order to overcome Italian resistance, they asked for the issue to be debated by a special commission in which voting would be by nations. As Jedin wrote, "Morone knew that they would no longer be satisfied with vague promises; during the Innsbruck negotiations he had personally guaranteed the emperor that the council would undertake reform seriously. Now was the time to keep the promise." After abandoning the attempt to evade the problem through a rapid conclusion of the proceedings - which would have caused scandal in Spain, France, and Germany alike - the pope in Rome and Morone in Trent accomplished "a masterpiece of curial diplomacy" 86. They exploited the imperial need to secure recognition of Maximilian's right of succession and the precarious personal and political position of the cardinal of Lorraine to isolate the Spanish opposition. In any case, if dissolving the assembly was impracticable, perhaps the princes themselves would not oppose a suspension. As the legates wrote on 16 August in a passage in which Morone's lucid analysis is easy to recognize, the end of the council would entail condemnation of the heretics and the consequent duty of the states "to take up arms" to execute its decrees. This was simply impossible in France, with a child king, "without money and without obedience," and "the entire kingdom infected by heresy." The situation of the Empire was no different, where it was reasonable to fear that "on seeing themselves condemned, the Protestants might reunite with France and England and turn the world upside down" 87.

Postponement of the session, originally planned for September, until 11 November 1563 88 allowed the French cardinal to travel to Rome. He was received with solemn honors and praised *summis laudibus* by the pope, who nevertheless did not appoint him legate either at Trent or in France, as he wished. His intention, by then wholly personal, was to seal a recovered concord with the pope, founded on his substantial abandonment of the Gallican demands he had supported until shortly before, and to establish a direct relationship with Pius IV that would free him from Morone's tutelage 89. Morone, for his part, did not fail to raise some doubts about him and his initiatives, though on 31 August he wrote that "thus far he perseveres well" 90. "The tactical alliance sealed between the two men in the summer of 1562 excluded neither reserve nor mistrust," Alain Tallon has written 91. In any event, everything had changed since only a few months earlier, on 27 May, Borromeo had used fiery words against the French cardinal. He had recommended giving him "in appearance all the satisfaction and honors possible," while privately subjecting him to all the "affronts he deserves for his insolence and instability," even suggesting that "some learned and eloquent friar-bishop friendly to us [...] wash his head freely in the congregations" 92.

3. "Thus One Rises to the Stars"

Meanwhile at Trent, after a brief pause, meetings of theologians and bishops had resumed. Many began to believe that the council would finally end before Christmas, partly because the question of matrimony did not appear to present serious difficulties 93. Events turned out differently, not so much because of clerical celibacy as because of profound differences from country to country in matrimonial practice, conflicting opinions on the validity of clandestine marriages or marriages contracted without parental consent, and the indissolubility of marriage even in cases of adultery. Strong disagreements also emerged on this delicate subject, which had first been discussed on 9 February, and approval of the decree *Tametsi* had to be postponed until the Twenty-Fourth Session of 11 November. "We spare ourselves no effort morning or evening, not without murmuring even from a large part of these prelates, who complain of not having half a day of rest," the legates wrote on 19 August, conscious of the problems they would have to confront, especially "this matter of clandestine marriage, which is becoming so entangled that one cannot see where it will end" 94. In mid-August Calini observed that the weeks were passing without "great progress," and the decree still faced "the same difficulties it had the first time discussion began" 95.

Shortly afterward, on 5 September, debate opened on the so-called "great reform project," based on a draft on which Morone and Gabriele Paleotti had worked at length. Paleotti was an able canonist and future archbishop of Bologna and cardinal; in Jedin's judgment, the two were "the true architects of Tridentine reform" 96. It was an ambitious project that imposed on the legates "continual splitting headaches, [...] which often make us wish to be anywhere else in the world rather than here, however uncomfortable and troublesome it might be" 97. It was exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, "to satisfy everyone" and to find a point of balance between the opposing intentions of the sovereigns and Rome. "The princes and their ministers here would like this reform to be very rigorous, and it is necessary to satisfy them in some measure so that everything is not thrown into jeopardy," Morone wrote on 1 September, while seeking "to bring the matter to the most honorable moderation possible." He complained that some cardinals were taking care to warn the council fathers that the pope opposed reform and were urging them to resist. This would only delay the council's conclusion and lead the princes to advance "harsher" demands, "because experience has shown that the more one temporizes in council, the more this blessed reform reaches into living flesh," he wrote, lamenting "that from Rome, whence I ought to expect assistance, impediment comes to me" 98. In reality these were only disruptive actions, since Borromeo never ceased reminding him of the pope's satisfaction with the endless "troubles" he was shouldering and continually confirmed the judgment that "the whole world" held of him 99. Morone's health itself became an important issue, raising fears that the council might lose his penetrating vision and firm hand 100. It is likely that those improper pressures, together with his ailments, contributed to his request to be allowed to withdraw from Trent 101.

One need only scan the extraordinarily dense correspondence of those months to understand the crushing workload he above all had to bear. His days were punctuated by attendance at general congregations and liturgies, and otherwise occupied from morning to evening with reading papers, news sheets, correspondence, and documents; commenting on and annotating them; drafting memoranda; writing not only to Borromeo but also to the emperor, nuncios, and private correspondents; intervening "with great gravity and prudence" 102 in debates; answering requests of every kind; meeting bishops, cardinals, and ambassadors; discussing matters with them sometimes for hours; conducting extremely delicate negotiations in which every word had to be weighed; understanding and anticipating the behavior of the many actors moving across the conciliar stage; formulating programs of action and assigning tasks; sharing decisions with his colleagues; and finding difficult, sometimes impossible, points of mediation among the many demands for which he, and he alone, even more than the pope himself, was the most authoritative point of reference, always pressed by the urgency of the issues on the table. On 13 September, for example, Muzio Calini reported that "in the morning from twelve until sixteen hours and after eating from twenty until evening, the lord legates and all the fathers remain in congregation with extreme patience" 103.

A month later, to give another example, nearing the end of an interminable letter dense with acute analyses and reflections, Morone apologized for the "long and disordered writing" in which he had set down his "sudden thoughts," prompted by the unexpected arrival of a courier from the nuncio at the imperial court, thoughts he entrusted to the pope's "supreme prudence." "Time presses and not an hour can be lost," he concluded, only to add a postscript returning in real time to the convulsive events of those weeks: "It occurs to me also to tell you..., one must also take care..., I think it useful also to recall..." 104. The next day he would have to write again to Borromeo and the emperor, and the day after to the nuncio in Spain, always surveying the entire European political and religious chessboard from above with an eagle's eye. On 8 November, together with the other legates, while informing Rome of a long speech by the cardinal of Lorraine on reform of the Church, he apologized for not writing a single word about it because he had no time 105. His was an immense task, and immense were the responsibilities he confronted with an energy, political intelligence, and dedication to the service of the Church possessed by no one else then at the summit of the curia. If at any moment during the council's final phase the *navicula Petri* had a pope at its helm, that pope was Giovanni Morone, at Trent rather than Rome, where Pius IV's great merit was to place complete trust in him and give him virtually a free hand. Carlo Borromeo and the pope himself were the first to acknowledge this 106.

As is evident, the problems connected with reform of the Church were numerous, intertwined, full of contradictions and serious consequences. One need only consider benefices: criteria of assignment and plurality of benefices, pensions, dispensations, rights of return, more or less covertly hereditary transmission, abbeys held in commendam, annates, curial taxation and Roman offices, appointment of parish priests, bishops, and cardinals, the financial resources of the latter, and so forth. Then there were episcopal jurisdiction, relations with cathedral chapters, exemptions of mendicant orders from the authority of ordinaries, pastoral visitations, diocesan synods, relations between metropolitan and suffragan sees, and formation of the clergy. It was an inextricable tangle and a gigantic bureaucratic machine around which revolved pontifical taxation and the entire system for exploiting and distributing the immense resources possessed by the Church in every corner of Europe. A first project in forty-two articles, sent to Rome in early June, provoked bitter protests from imperial, French, and Spanish representatives, who wanted to hear nothing about reform of princes, partly because the project abolished many of their rights and privileges while reaffirming ecclesiastical jurisdiction and the fiscal immunity of Church property 107.

Reconciling such distant positions immediately appeared difficult, raising the prospect that Trent was heading toward another dramatic crisis or an inglorious failure. On 5 September the first twenty-one articles were presented, and their examination began in the general congregation of the eleventh 108. They generated heated debate, accompanied by the "idle talk" of those in Rome who pressed the council fathers by writing "that His Beatitude does not approve the rigor of the reform," despite "the sincerity and candor of spirit" with which the pope had always acted, as Borromeo complained in a letter to the legates dated the fifteenth 109. Stirred up by that "idle talk," equally bitter was the opposition of numerous Italian bishops, bound hand and foot to the curial practices the reform sought to eliminate, and above all of many cardinals. Foremost among them was the immensely wealthy Alessandro Farnese, joined by his brother Ranuccio, Luigi d'Este, Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, and Giambattista Cicala, who, Hubert Jedin wrote, "incited their own 'clients' against Morone" 110. It was partly in response to such improper pressure that Morone judged it appropriate to ask Rome for authorization to leave his post and depart from Trent, using as a pretext "the air, which is contrary to him" 111.

The proposal to insert into the decree the clause *salva auctoritate sedis apostolicae* reopened the conflict between the Spaniards and the zealots, mostly Italians, who sought to water the decree down, while the cardinal of Lorraine revived Gallican demands with the clause *salvis iuribus regnorum*, on which the queen mother strongly insisted 112. Indeed, as noted above, the French cardinal soon traveled to Rome to negotiate with the pope a political agreement that would permit the council's conclusion. This initiative was not coordinated with the Paris court, which he no longer represented. After his departure, the French ambassador Arnaud du Ferrier delivered a very harsh intervention in the congregation of 23 September. He declared that the Church had needed reform for three centuries and that what had been proposed to the council was only "a plaster." It was necessary, he argued, "to abolish annates, dispensations, reservations, rights of return, plurality of benefices, exemptions, and everything that can be included in this category," pressing the point as forcefully as possible. He added that the king of France, as founder of all the churches of the realm, "by divine right was master of all their goods and revenues and could directly use them *pro necessitate reipublicae*," and announced that the crown and episcopate would tolerate no injury to the Gallican liberties. He threatened a formal protest and the withdrawal of the French from Trent, after which they would deal directly with the holy see over reform of the Gallican Church. He thus disavowed the conciliatory policy of the cardinal of Lorraine and brought the "two French conciliar policies" to their point of maximum divergence 113. Morone was not alone in interpreting his words as a blatant repudiation of Lorraine's "good disposition," an intention "to break," and a threat "to separate entirely from obedience to the apostolic see and reduce that kingdom as Henry VIII did England" 114. All the more so because after his intervention du Ferrier left Trent and withdrew to Venice.

Although imperial and Spanish representatives continued to raise old and new problems, reviving among other matters the festering question of the clause *proponentibus legatis* 115, the anti-curial front did not reunite. This left Morone room to insert himself with his customary skill into the political fractures among

the various camps. The count of Luna had to abandon his intention of presenting a formal protest to the assembly because Ferdinand I dissociated himself from the initiative and instead urged a swift conclusion of the council. His poor health led him to regard his son's succession to the throne as imminent; Maximilian was much less devoted than he to the holy see and had already been entrusted with a large part of political affairs 116. Morone promptly grasped the emperor's willingness to close the council, although, conscious of the extreme weakness of his power in a Germany besieged by "Protestants and Turks, with few forces," he continued to believe that Ferdinand would be unable to enforce the conciliar decrees and indeed would not even be able to defend himself if the heretics, "for fear of being invaded, should invade him." In any case, he was the most pliable interlocutor and the one most willing to meet Roman demands. The king of Spain took the opposite position. He sought to prevent a hasty conclusion of the assembly and, as noted above, wanted it to deliberate on many additional subjects: indulgences, purgatory, veneration of images, fasts, and so forth. The king of France did likewise, "because he is a child and has tainted counselors, and his kingdom is exhausted and divided, surrounded by Swiss, German, and English heretics who can inspire great fear in him."

As Morone had anticipated, on returning to Trent on 5 November the cardinal of Lorraine also declared himself determined to avoid further delays and quickly reach an agreement. The Milanese cardinal's realism succeeded in persuading Pius IV to retreat from an intransigent line and accept some compromise in the field of reform. Increasingly isolated, the Spanish opposition too began to soften, allowing Morone to avoid a "continuation and prolongation so pernicious" and direct the assembly's work rapidly toward a swift conclusion. Such a conclusion had become indispensable, quite apart from the enormous costs and the consequences of so many prelates' prolonged absence from their dioceses, in order to free the holy see from the check imposed by the great powers and the constant blackmail of the bishops themselves, often "unrestrained" and "importunate" in advancing continual demands as the price of their support for curial positions 117. On 8 November Morone could announce to Rome that the imminent session "will bring us very close to the end, and afterward we shall set fire to the rest" 118.

The greater part was done, in short, although on the eve of approval of the delicate decrees on matrimony and reform of the Church, fixed for 11 November, conflict remained intense. In any case, after numerous last-minute corrections and deletions, all the decrees were approved in an interminable session lasting fully eleven hours and punctuated by continual votes. All the prelates remained "vested pontifically and fasting; and no one suffered more from it than Lord Cardinal Morone, who as first legate had to perform all the ceremonies," Filippo Gheri wrote to Juan Manrique de Lara 119. That same 11 November the Milanese cardinal could inform Borromeo that they had finally "emerged from the most dangerous reefs we had in this sea of the council, which may truly be called a sea because of its constant fluctuation" 120. Only then could the hope expressed by the cardinal-nephew in a letter of 23 October be fulfilled. He had entrusted to Morone's "great prudence" the task of bringing the council to an end and freeing himself, the bishops gathered at Trent, the Church, and "the whole world from so great a trouble" 121, ending "that martyrdom" and winning "the crown that is truly owed to you," he added on 3 November 122. The next session, the Twenty-Fifth and final one, was set for 9 December, less than a month later.

The precarious Peace of Amboise, which in March had ended the first French war of religion 123, although France was also at war with England, and the physical decline of Ferdinand of Habsburg, who would die in July 1564, helped accelerate the proceedings. The identity of views at Trent between the papal legates and the cardinal of Lorraine was of great importance, and their agreement with the imperial and Portuguese parties finally made it possible to achieve the "Tridentine compromise" 124, isolating the Spanish opposition led by the count of Luna, who opposed dissolving the assembly. Nearly everyone, however, was convinced that Philip II's consent was also imminent and that the assembly should indeed be dissolved as quickly as possible. On 15 November Morone declared himself certain "that the matter has been set on a course from which it can no longer escape our hands," and on the twenty-fifth he assured Rome "that we intend to strike the iron while it is hot and [...] shall do everything in our power not to let it cool or slip from our hands" 125.

That very day the general congregation began discussing with unusual speed the final fourteen articles on reform of the Church 126. "Here the conclusion of the council is pursued with such diligence that it may be called haste rather than solicitude," Calini wrote on 18 November, observing that this "ardor" was shown not only by the legates but by all the fathers, partly from exhaustion and partly because they were now "persuaded that no greater benefit could be done to Christendom" and eager to return to their dioceses. Many were already packing their belongings and hiring barges and boats to carry them as far as Verona. The cardinal of Lorraine did not hesitate to tell the count of Luna that "whether or not the council ends, once the day appointed for the session has passed, he intends in any case to return to France with all his prelates" 127. Morone himself declared in congregation that both the dogmatic questions and "the matters most necessary concerning reform" had been resolved 128, and that the remaining articles on cardinals, princes, ecclesiastical immunities, hospitals, mendicant and monastic orders, and nuns were now "mature." All were extremely delicate questions that in the past might have occupied the assembly at length, but now found compromise solutions in only four days 129. Once the decision had been made to close the council as soon as possible, Morone did so with great rapidity. "He thinks and aspires to nothing but ending the assembly's work and does not wish to lose either time or opportunity," the bishop of Salamanca, Pedro González de Mendoza, noted in his diary 130.

The working commissions created to prepare debate on indulgences, purgatory, images, invocation of the saints, and veneration of relics proceeded swiftly 131. In overcoming the last Spanish resistance 132, a crucial role was played by news reaching Trent on the evening of 30 November that the pope had suffered a grave illness, "an attack of vertigo" serious enough to cast doubt on his survival, as Borromeo had written on the twenty-seventh 133. The report was probably disseminated or exaggerated deliberately. Morone worked to lend it credibility by spreading the word that the cardinals should prepare to travel to Rome for the conclave 134 and reminding everyone that during a vacancy of the apostolic see the legates ceased to hold office. The council would thus remain without guidance, with the grave risk that a papal election might open a conciliarist abyss by substituting the assembly of bishops for the College of Cardinals. Whether the news was true or false, the Milanese cardinal kept his composure and did not panic. Rather, he quickly used "so harsh and unpleasant an occasion to accelerate the conclusion as much as possible" 135. Shortly afterward in Rome, summarizing the events of his legation, he would affirm that in overcoming the apparently insurmountable obstacles to the council's conclusion, assistance had come from "what was feared might do harm, namely the report of the pope's illness" 136. The general congregation of 2 December hastily approved the last decrees, and even the count of Luna, recognizing that he now stood alone in opposition, abandoned the solemn protest whose written text he had brought with him. Morone was even able to advance the session to 3 December and did not change the date when reassuring news of the pope's condition arrived from Rome that evening. That same day Borromeo wrote serenely that "His Holiness is now perfectly well" 137. The last storm too was thus overcome, and voting on the decrees could be completed the following day.

Early in the morning the legates informed the council fathers that they would ask the assembly to approve one by one the canons enacted since the first convocation under Paul III, in order to secure the assent of the French bishops who had not previously attended Trent. At the end of the session, by an unexpected unanimous vote, the council was formally declared concluded, and it was established that the validity of its decrees would be subject to papal approval 138. After all had pronounced their *placet* and the anathema against every heretic, the Milanese cardinal, as first president, solemnly proclaimed to the assembly: "Most Illustrious and Reverend Fathers, the council is ended; go in peace" 139. General emotion followed, amid the strains of the *Te Deum laudamus*, joyous acclamations, and promises to observe the conciliar decrees forever 140. As the bishop of Salamanca recorded in his diary, "such was the joy and gladness, and with them the devotion, that on that day they seemed infused by God into the hearts of all, especially those who were present, and copious tears were shed from pure joy" 141. The following day the bishops were called to sign the acts. The count of Luna refused to do so, because Philip II's assent arrived only on 6 December, when most bishops had already left Trent 142.

On Wednesday the eighth Morone, exhausted, hurriedly departed for Rome 143. He arrived with Simonetta on the twenty-third and was received with great honors 144. There was also much gossip, perhaps fueled by some imprudent remark from the pope, who was irritated with many cardinals who, because of his poor health, had already begun forming alliances in view of the succession. It is worth reading what Michele Facchetto wrote to Giovan Francesco Stella on 1 January 1564 145:

> Now the pope says that he wishes to create cardinals only in favor of the Most Illustrious Cardinal and that by every means he wishes him to be his successor. The Most Illustrious Borromeo says the same, so that envy is growing. Throughout Rome one hears nothing but discussion of the favors shown to Lord Cardinal Morone. All the Most Illustrious Cardinals, one by one, have come to visit him and show him great affection, and they remain highly satisfied with his management of the council.

Shortly afterward, in his final report, the Milanese cardinal outlined a summary history of his legation: eight months of labor and responsibility in guiding the conciliar machine as few others could have done. At the time of his arrival in Trent, no one believed that the pope desired any reform; all the bishops from beyond the Alps were hostile to the pope; and more tangled than ever was the knot of "discord, rivalry, contention, slander, lengthy votes, and irrelevant digressions" created during the preceding months. Everything "was reduced to dogma and *ius divinum*, and ever new disputes and grievances were introduced." Little by little he had succeeded in changing matters, establishing a climate of trust despite persistent political conflicts, achieving a community of purpose first with the emperor and then with the cardinal of Lorraine, maintaining in any event a relationship of personal esteem with the Spanish ambassador and moderating his opposition, and addressing one after another the many complex problems on the table. Morone would proudly claim both the long list of decrees enacted by the council in doctrine and reform and the merit of having secured agreement on their subordination to papal approval, "although the matter was controversial," and on unanimous acceptance of the clause *salva sedis apostolicae auctoritate*, "for if the authority of the apostolic see is preserved, everything else is preserved." Even the cardinal of Lorraine, who at first "defended the Sorbonne," had ultimately assented in the concluding acclamations to the declaration "that the pope was shepherd of the universal Church; and may it please God to preserve him for a long time" 146.

More than once the conciliar enterprise had seemed on the verge of shipwreck, and only with great effort did Rome finally succeed in imposing its theses to a considerable degree, containing the radical reform of the clergy demanded by Vienna, Valladolid, and Paris, avoiding the imperial request for the lawfulness of clerical marriage and the chalice for the laity in German lands, and eluding the conciliarist and autonomist claims of the Gallican episcopate. It succeeded above all thanks to Morone, although, as Jedin himself admitted, "the reform of the Church decreed in the council's final two sessions left substantially intact the curial system formed in the late Middle Ages. [...] The reform decree was a compromise and suffered from all the weaknesses of a compromise. [...] What is commonly called the 'Tridentine reform' was at first only an opportunity, not a reality" 147. From this standpoint, closing the council was a political masterpiece by the legate. He convinced the secular princes that the pope would enact the reforms, while limiting himself to verbal commitments that the Roman curia would honor only in part and often belatedly, ultimately betraying the very spirit in which the assembly of bishops dissolved.

In any case, "the praise for this entire undertaking" was due above all to him, Muzio Calini wrote 148. Already on 18 November of that year Borromeo had expressed his gratitude and admiration, acknowledging that "Our Lord, this entire court, and all good men have and truly ought to have an infinite obligation to you" 149. Six days later Tolomeo Gallio, secretary to Pius IV 150, informed him that in Rome no one could speak of the council "without bursting into praise of you," beginning with the pope. "Thus one rises to the stars," he concluded 151. On 3 December Pius IV himself expressed his gratitude for Morone's ability to conclude the conciliar enterprise, "by which he has delivered the Church of God from such distress in such dangerous times, with so celebrated a convocation of fathers" 152. Ten days later in consistory he again declared the debt owed by the whole Church to the Milanese cardinal. On 30 December, at another meeting of the College of Cardinals, besides appointing him to supervise whatever was done in consistory 153, the pope once again praised Morone as a prelate "of great worth for his strength and greatness of spirit and most experienced in all the decisions taken at Trent, in which he had participated with the highest praise" 154.

4. Morone and the Holy Office during the Conciliar Legation

More than twenty years had passed since the first, unsuccessful convocation of 1542, which Morone had likewise presided over together with Reginald Pole. The fact that between the two assemblies the Milanese cardinal had spent a long period imprisoned in Castel Sant'Angelo and had undergone a heresy trial that dragged on for almost a decade offers striking evidence of the contradictions, conflicts, and internal lacerations that marked the Counter-Reformation Church's profound ideological, institutional, and pastoral redefinition, as the revival of those charges under Pius V would shortly confirm 155. The extraordinary commitment he displayed at Trent, the decisive importance of his efforts to safeguard and indeed strengthen papal authority, and his defense of Catholic orthodoxy there did not for a moment shake the convictions of the former *summus ac perpetuus inquisitor*, Fra Michele Ghislieri, concerning the heretical deviations of which Morone had been guilty and which nothing and no one could ever erase: *semel haereticus, semper haereticus*. It was as though every action that presented Morone as a faithful follower, or even a bulwark, of the Church could only seem to Ghislieri proof of his opportunism, his ability to conceal the poison in order to spread it more effectively, and therefore of the danger he represented. That obtuse and fanatical ascetic friar, destined for the tiara and the glory of the altars, was certainly not the person best suited to understand Morone's intellectual and moral stature; but the conflict between the two men - political and religious, personal and institutional - reveals with exceptional clarity the contradictions and struggles just described.

During Morone's presidency, moreover, the council itself had to deal with inquisitorial affairs 156. One example came when Philip II's plan to introduce the Spanish Inquisition into Milan further complicated already difficult relations with Spain and aroused intense fear among his subjects, just as would happen the following year in Naples, where violent street riots led by the nobility erupted 157. In Lombardy as in Campania, everyone understood that the plan's chief purpose was not to hunt heretics more efficiently but to create an instrument for strengthening royal absolutism. That was how it had operated in Spain, and that was how Philip II wanted it to operate in Milan and Naples. Attentive to events in his native city, Morone declared himself opposed to any such initiative, while also taking the opportunity to demonstrate his loyalty to the supreme guardians of the faith. "Establishing the office of the Holy Inquisition in Milan is a good and holy thing, especially when it is well governed," he wrote to his fellow Milanese Borromeo on 9 August 1563, while observing that "it could cause great harm and turmoil if badly governed, […] and therefore care must be taken that under no circumstances should it depend in substance on anything other than the holy tribunal of Rome." The cardinal-nephew held the same opinion. On the twenty-first he replied that the need to maintain good relations with the king of Spain in view of the council's conclusion required him to accommodate the request, provided that the feared tribunal depended not on the Spanish Inquisition but on the pope. A delegation from Cremona came to Morone and asked him to intercede with Pius IV. Milan, meanwhile, eager to oppose an initiative from which it had everything to fear, hurriedly sent ambassadors to Spain, Trent, and Rome; the last of these - clearly *pour cause* - was Count Sforza Morone, the cardinal's brother 158.

During his presidency, the council also dealt with a number of heterodox believers who appealed to it as the supreme judicial authority, capable of absolving more leniently than the Roman Holy Office those who presented themselves voluntarily, settling disputed cases, and readmitting to the bosom of the Church foreigners who had been won over by the Reformation but wished to return to the old faith. The case of Giovanni Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, was undoubtedly of particular interest to Morone. In the early 1550s Grimani had faced inquisitorial charges from which he believed he had freed himself through the canonical purgation pronounced in 1553. In vain he persuaded himself that Paul IV's death had removed every obstacle to obtaining the cardinalate for which he had never ceased to hope, especially since the new pope had expressed a desire to gratify the Venetian Republic - and to administer yet another rebuff to the Holy Office. Yet despite his explicit promises, Pius IV too was ultimately forced, after an extremely bitter confrontation, to bow to the inquisitors' veto, for they were still capable of imposing their decisions on his will 159. For the patriarch of Aquileia, in short, the battle was lost. The last person to accept this was

Grimani himself, unwilling to see the longed-for red hat slip from his grasp after he had come within a step of securing it. He therefore decided to continue the struggle by appealing to the Tridentine assembly and entrusting it with judgment of his case.

This high-handed initiative, which amounted to an open repudiation of the Holy Office, deeply irritated both Philip II 160 and Pius IV. In March 1562 the pope threatened to abandon Grimani to his fate, since such "violent and furious methods" could only "produce great scandals and troubles." The affair dragged wearily on over the following months, until Morone assumed the presidency - Morone "who had always been a defender of the patriarch," Francisco Vargas commented with displeasure 161. On the eve of Morone's departure, the pope, increasingly at odds with the inquisitors, entrusted him with Grimani's case file, thereby delegating the final decision in this long-standing affair to the council. On 18 June the patriarch himself arrived at Trent, advised not to create any "uproar." Under continual pressure from the ambassadors of the Venetian Republic, the papal legates engaged in intensive negotiations and then appointed a commission of bishops and abbots. In early August Morone "presented this affair with great favor and with a marked display of affection toward the lord patriarch, saying that he had always known him over many years as a most worthy prelate of singular virtue." After this unequivocal introduction, the proceedings ended within a few days, and all the delegates unanimously judged that in Grimani's writings "they had found nothing whatever that was not in conformity with Catholic truth" 162.

The sentence declaring him *innocentem et catholicum* was pronounced on 5 September 1563 and published on the seventeenth. It was immediately followed by congratulations from almost all the bishops present at the council - "the malicious being of a contrary opinion" 163 - and from Emperor Ferdinand of Habsburg himself. Once the council had removed every suspicion of heresy, the obstacle that had prevented the pope from formalizing Grimani's appointment as cardinal, for which the consistory had authorized him in 1561, disappeared. But inquisitorial opposition remained insuperable, and Grimani's frantic efforts to demonstrate doctrinal rigor and zeal in suppressing heresy were of no avail. Despite the Tridentine acquittal, his inquisitorial dossier continued to grow during these years. In the end, notwithstanding all his promises, his attempt to bring the Holy Office back under control, and his effort to place some limit on Michele Ghislieri's unchallenged power within it, the pope lacked the strength to impose his will. This demonstrated that nothing in Rome could then be decided without - and still less against - the inquisitors' *placet* 164.

The irreducible tenacity with which the Holy Office continued to act as a separate body, reserving broad margins of autonomy and secrecy from papal authority, is confirmed by a significant episode involving Morone himself in the final months of the Tridentine legation, when he was devoting himself body and soul to bringing the council safely into port and protecting the primacy of the Holy See. At the height of his power, praised without reservation by pope and emperor, by the cardinal of Lorraine and the count de Luna, he learned with deep displeasure that the inquisitors were still undeterredly collecting evidence and documents against him. Yet on 7 September 1563 his Roman agent Pier Luigi Fedeli wrote that at the Holy Office congregation held the day before in the pope's presence, Pius IV had declared that the first priority was the conclusion of the council. If severity were needed to achieve that end, "let it be used, though it pains him; but if gentleness would serve better to conclude it quickly, he is content for that to be used; and it was resolved to leave severity, kindness, moderation, the sweet and the bitter to the lord legates" 165. Yet as late as 1564 the Roman Holy Office would record the testimony of Benedetto Accolti, the dissolute nephew of the cardinal of Ravenna of the same name and the instigator of a plot to assassinate Pius IV. Accolti declared that he knew of no one in Rome who kept heretical books at home, "unless it were someone in Cardinal Morone's household, for in Modena […] they regarded him as a protector of this sect" 166.

As we have seen, immediately after his election Pius IV had entrusted Cardinals Ghislieri and Puteo with the final assessment of Morone's trial papers before issuing the sentence 167. Given the great speed with which the pope intended to close this embarrassing affair, both men had a copy at their disposal. It is highly significant that immediately after the death of the French cardinal Puteo in Rome on 26 April 1563, the future Pius V promptly sent someone to seize the copy in his possession. Learning of this during the Tridentine legation, Morone wrote to Fedeli and asked him to speak to Tolomeo Gallio. On 13 October

Gallio replied that he had immediately informed the pope about the “removed trial papers.” Somewhat astonished to learn that documents of such delicacy had remained in Puteo’s possession rather than with the inquisitorial notary, Pius IV ordered the man who had physically carried out the seizure to give him a detailed account of what had happened. Two days later, reporting this conversation to Morone, Gallio told him that Ghislieri himself had ordered the papers to be taken. “His Holiness has told me that he will speak to the cardinal,” he concluded, “but I shall not press him until Your Most Illustrious Lordship informs me whether there is anything you wish me to mention in this regard” 168.

After reporting further details on 16 October 169, Fedeli wrote again a week later to say that Gallio, fresh from a conversation with Cardinal Alessandrino, had learned that among Puteo’s papers there were “many writings concerning the office of the Inquisition.” Ghislieri had seized them only because “they were better kept” in his own archives, and he insisted that “in no way had he thought ill of Your Lordship, because, being your friend and having signed the sentence, he would thereby be seeking his own dishonor.” Shortly afterward Ghislieri had again summoned Gallio, both to apologize and to assure him of his goodwill toward Morone, while also expressing regret that the pope had been brought into the matter. He was anxious to explain that his interest had not been confined to Morone’s trial, but extended to all the documents of the Holy Office. With “a thousand other fair words,” he reassured Gallio that there had been nothing personal in the affair, so that Fedeli wrote to the Milanese cardinal that he could “remain at ease about this” 170.

Morone, however, alarmed by the speed with which Paul IV’s supreme inquisitor had moved to obtain those papers, had in the meantime asked the papal secretary to intervene and secure their delivery. Every effort proved vain. Through Gallio himself, who wrote on 27 October, Ghislieri took the satisfaction of telling his Milanese colleague that there was no reason to become so agitated: the trial file would be safe in the Holy Office, and he would never surrender anything from it “except by an order of His Holiness *in scriptis*” 171. Despite his gratitude for all Morone was doing at Trent, the pope lacked the strength or courage to issue such an order. Gallio’s letter also shows that what Morone most wanted was the copy of his *confessio* on which Pius IV had caused the opinions of four eminent theologians to be written, attesting the complete orthodoxy of the text 172. It was an important document, whose existence the cardinal may only then have learned of. After exhausting negotiations, he would at last wring from Alessandrino a promise to provide him with a copy. The episode reveals that more than three years after the reigning pope had pronounced his acquittal, the trial still lay at the center of unscrupulous curial maneuvering. And all this occurred in the last months of 1563, when Morone succeeded in completing his conciliar legation and closing the Council of Trent to Rome’s full satisfaction.

It appears, however, that Cardinal Alessandrino soon afterward also lost the copy that had belonged to Cardinal Puteo. In the summer of 1564 it probably sank to the bottom of the sea, together with several precious chests of inquisitorial documents, when pirates attacked the ship carrying them from Rome to Mondovì, his small Piedmontese diocese. There can be little doubt that he meant to place them in safety at a moment when tension between the Inquisition and the papacy was again becoming incandescent 173, arrogating to himself a kind of monopoly over them beyond any institutional framework and in defiance of the pope’s supreme authority. Naturally, the Morone trial file must have been among them; with it Ghislieri intended to reopen the question of the 1560 acquittal, as indeed he would do - without even the mask of formal courtesies and hypocritical professions of goodwill - at the next papal election 174. Fortunately for him, shortly before the disastrous loss of the evidence against Morone that he had managed to secure in the spring of 1563, Ghislieri had acquired another copy, the one kept by Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, himself a former inquisitor.

On 2 January 1566 a letter from Giovan Francesco Commendone informed Giovanni Andrea Caligari that, according to reports, the copy of Morone’s trial proceedings which the newly elected pope - following the example of his mentor and master Paul IV - had carried into the conclave was the one Cardinal Carpi had once had made “in the greatest secrecy, to use in such emergencies,” disobeying the papal order that all such copies be destroyed. Only on the eve of his death, which came on 2 May 1564, had he finally handed it to Cardinal Alessandrino, who did not hesitate to display it in order to prevent the Milanese cardinal’s election

175. On the eve of the conclave, 5 January 1565, the Spanish ambassador Don Luis de Requesens informed Philip II that he had repeatedly discussed Morone's trial with both Ghislieri and Carpi. Carpi "was always suspicious of him," Requesens wrote, adding that one of the cardinal's secretaries had told him Morone had tried "after his death to lay hands on certain papers that could have caused him serious harm" 176. Partly for this reason, as an enduring token of gratitude toward the man who had always stood beside him in directing the supreme tribunal of the faith, Ghislieri, after ascending the papal throne as Pius V, had Cardinal Carpi's austere funerary monument erected in the church of Trinità dei Monti. It contains his bust in an aedicule surmounted by the papal arms, with a porphyry sarcophagus before it bearing the inscription *IN CVSTODIA CATHOLICAE VERITTATIS* 177. It may not have been accidental that Pius IV - certainly aware of the relationship between the two men - entrusted Morone with visiting the dying cardinal in his name. Carpi had been reduced to skin and bones, "utterly wasted away, so that anyone who sees him feels compassion," though one may doubt that Morone's visit was "very welcome" to him 178. In 1568 yet another copy of Morone's trial came into Pope Ghislieri's hands, the one preserved among the papers of Cardinal Vitellozzo Vitelli, a former member of the inquisitorial congregation who in August 1559 had opposed Morone's admission to the conclave 179. After Vitelli's death on 19 November of that year, his heirs put the papers up for sale, and at Alessandro Farnese's request Pius V had them seized 180.

Meanwhile, in the very year 1563 that witnessed Morone's conciliar triumph, Pietro Perna published at Basel one of the most subversive books of the European religious sixteenth century: Bernardino Ochino's *Dialogi XXX*. There the former friar spelled out the final consequences of the long journey that had led him from the foundation of the Capuchin order, through "preaching Christ masked in jargon" throughout Italy, to exile in Geneva in 1542; then, after the burning of Miguel Servet in 1553, to a break with the Swiss churches; and finally to antitrinitarianism and his last refuge in Poland and Moravia 181. Dialogue XXVIII dealt with the punishment of heretics and drew profusely on Sebastiano Castellio's anti-Calvinist polemics; not by chance, Castellio had translated Ochino's text into Latin. The interlocutors through whom the former Sienese friar developed the dialogue, Pius IV and Morone, transferred to distant papal Rome a question that remained fiercely controversial in Switzerland. For a decade, between Geneva and Basel, Zurich and the Grisons, an entire radical wing led by Italian exiles had been completing its break with Genevan orthodoxy 182. Entrusting the defense of the repression of heretics to the man then seated on the throne of the Roman Antichrist, concerned only to reaffirm his right to burn those who threatened his empire 183, sharpened the dialogue's anti-Calvinist polemic. In those pages, by contrast, Morone appeared as the champion of heretics. Before entering into the substance of the question, he claimed the right to defend them without thereby being identified with them, contrary to the deplorable custom imposed by dominant orthodoxies. Since dissenters follow what they believe to be the truth, they must not be harassed, but rather assisted and above all instructed. To decree the death of an unwitting heretic is to prevent his repentance and condemn him to eternal punishment, or at most to induce him to lie by professing belief in what he does not in fact believe 184. Heresy, Ochino had Morone declare, is nothing more than "an error of the mind, and therefore a spiritual matter"; the use of repressive violence is wholly useless and indeed counterproductive 185. It was almost as though Ochino had read the note in which, far back in 1536, Morone had summarized the premises of his diplomatic action in Germany: "Heretics must be treated with gentleness and kindly invited to return to their former customs" 186.

5. "After All the Uproar | Raised at Trent, | Pasquin, What Was Decided?"

The body of canons approved by the Council of Trent at its final meeting was imposing. They addressed the sacrificial character of the Mass, marriage, religious orders, priestly ordination, the residence requirement for bishops and parish priests, diocesan synods, pastoral visitations, seminaries, sacred images, the veneration of the saints, purgatory, indulgences, baptismal registers, and much else besides. A special commission was charged with revising Paul IV's draconian Index of Prohibited Books. Its work would issue in the more moderate Tridentine Index published in March 1564, although inquisitors soon imposed new restrictions, especially on the prohibition against reading the Bible in the vernacular, which for centuries would prevent the Catholic laity from knowing the word of God except as mediated by ecclesiastical

teaching. By virtue of a conciliar resolution promoted by Morone, as mentioned above 187, these decrees were made subject to papal approval, thereby reaffirming the primacy of the Apostolic See. Prepared by a commission of five cardinals, including Morone, and drafted by Paleotti, the bull *Benedictus Deus* was proclaimed by Pius IV in the consistory of 26 January 1564, after the Milanese cardinal himself urged its issuance 188. Like Simonetta, Morone thereby drew criticism from advocates of greater episcopal autonomy. They knew that "the pope was more hardened in favor of this confirmation […], and, not daring to attack the prince, they attack his ministers," Michele Facchetto commented on 29 January 1564 189. The fact that this confirmation was not published until 30 June clearly indicates the extent of continuing resistance, including that of Cardinal Ghislieri, who held that "too much authority had been given to the bishops and it was necessary to moderate it" 190.

The bull - which met with vigorous opposition from the Catholic king 191 and was not received in France, in defense of the rights of the Gallican Church - prohibited the publication of any commentary on the Tridentine decrees without the Apostolic See's consent. Rome thus appropriated the decrees while simultaneously claiming the right to be their unanswerable interpreter and reserving the final word on how their provisions should be applied. To that end, in the solemn discourse celebrating the conclusion of the council, delivered in the consistory of 30 December 1563 192, the pope entrusted a special commission of eight cardinals with ensuring that the decrees were everywhere observed rigorously, *inviolate*, as the future cardinal Silvio Antoniano would later say in his funeral oration for Pius IV 193. In the decades that followed, an energetic reassertion of Roman centralism would in fact weaken and at times contradict not only the decentralized, episcopalist model of the Church advocated by many bishops with the support of the Catholic monarchies, but many of the reform measures themselves 194. During the long trial of strength between the Holy See and the Spanish crown over the inquisitorial prosecution of Bartolomé Carranza, the pope himself declared bluntly that he "stood above the council" and "could do whatever he pleased," as a Roman newsletter of 1 December 1565 reported 195.

The defeat of the reforming episcopate, moreover, was accompanied by a revival of the mendicant orders and the confirmation of their ancient privileges and exemptions, which in many cases removed them from ordinary episcopal jurisdiction. This was particularly true of the Franciscans and Dominicans, who from their origins had been firmly embedded in inquisitorial structures and within them had pursued the entire careers of men such as Michele Ghislieri and Felice Peretti, soon to ascend the papal throne as Pius V and Sixtus V. As early as 1561 Beccadelli observed at Trent that "this council has so far seemed more like a chapter of the friars of Saint Dominic than anything else, so many Dominican prelates are here and continue to appear" 196. This too was a sign of the political and religious success of the intransigent line, founded on the priority of safeguarding orthodoxy over reforming the Church. The political and religious supremacy soon regained by the Holy Office at the summit of the papal curia meant that the conciliar decrees concerning reform of the clergy, its recruitment and education, the benefice system, conventual life, the sacramental and liturgical practices of the laity, and their catechetical instruction would be implemented only in a subordinate way. The primary need was strict control over the faithful's doctrinal orthodoxy and conformity of their sacramental and liturgical practices to ecclesiastical norms. The result was a pervasive clericalization of religious life and a pastoral regime of obedience founded on a sharp separation between clergy and laity. On the one hand it was nourished by precepts, traditions, and habits rather than genuine religious awareness; by devotional, miraculous, protective, and apotropaic cults; by a pedagogy of fear regarding the afterlife; and by generous latitude in confessional absolution. On the other, it was marked by distrust and censorship - and, where necessary, severe repression - of every form of intellectual freedom and every religious manifestation outside the official channels of magisterium and pastoral care.

This framework also encompassed, in the same year that saw the promulgation of the conciliar decrees, the establishment of commissions charged with reforming the Index, the breviary, and the missal; the rule requiring bishops, abbots, priors, and parish priests to swear to the *Professio fidei tridentinae* on assuming office; and the beginning of work on a catechism *ex decreto concilii tridentini*, the so-called Roman Catechism, approved in 1566 197. This reflected not only concern for theological orthodoxy but renewed

attention to the Christian education of the young. The congregations of regular clerics founded in those decades devoted themselves to this task with particular zeal. They had emerged in different ways from the century's religious crisis, from its anxieties, its desire for reform, and at times its very heterodox tensions 198. The Theatines, Somaschans, Barnabites, and Jesuits - especially the latter, highly appreciated by the pope also for the role they played at Trent in defending curialist positions - found broad scope for action in education, assistance, and charity, while the colonization of the New World opened entire continents to the expansion of the Catholic faith.

The fact remains that, despite the efforts of an entire generation of bishops and the rules they issued to impose renewed discipline on the faithful's religious life, restore dignity to sacred spaces and the liturgy, and instill new moral rigor and pride in ministry among priests with care of souls through diocesan synods, general edicts, and pastoral visitations, the records of those visitations reveal the extreme slowness, fragility, and at times almost complete absence of change in the religious practices of clergy and laity even decades after the council. This was especially true in the still weakly Christianized world of the countryside and the most isolated valleys. Very little changed in the papal curia's government of the benefice system and so-called spiritual taxation, where practices that had effectively survived the conciliar storm continued 199. The Tridentine decrees themselves were sometimes disregarded to guarantee the primacy of orthodoxy, which had become the heart of the Church's identity, thereby weakening the much-desired moral reform *in capite et in membris*. This is evident in the substantial continuity of curial practices, clerical customs, and the faithful's religious life, especially after the reforming impetus of the brief post-conciliar period faded under the Borghese, Barberini, and Chigi. During the pontificate of the austere and intransigent Pope Ghislieri, only a few years after the council's conclusion, Cardinal Ferdinando de' Medici wrote from Rome to his sister Isabella in February 1569 that he rejoiced in the great "freedom secretly enjoyed here." "We are exempt from the reforms," he wrote with relief. Soon afterward he could be portrayed in a painting by Iacopo Zucchi as a bold, half-naked hunter behind the voluptuous and scantily dressed Clelia Farnese, his alleged mistress and illegitimate daughter of the "great cardinal" Alessandro, nephew of Paul III, amid a profusion of symbols of eroticism and fertility 200.

None of this prevented the early emergence of a kind of myth of Trent as the promoter of incisive reforms and the foundational turning point in the Church's history. A tenacious historiography long repeated this view and, not without paradoxical distortions, even perceived the council as a turn toward modernity through the social disciplining said to mark a substantial convergence between state and ecclesiastical institutions, despite their differing political and confessional forms 201. In the light of late-sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources, which reveal a degradation of the clergy and religious life in many respects similar to that of the early sixteenth century, it is very difficult to accept Jedin's triumphalism. According to him, in addition to the definitive condemnation of Protestant heresies, "the true substance of the Tridentine Reform consists in the decrees that Cardinal Morone, by saving the council at the moment of its gravest crisis, brought safely into port in the final three sessions, that is, in the summer and autumn of 1563." These reforms were anything but radical, the Silesian historian had to acknowledge: they renounced "the transformation of the Roman curia and of the constitution of the Church," left aside "the inexhaustible subject of the curia's financial practices" - the crucial issues of authentic reform - and concentrated instead on pastoral care of souls, while wholly ignoring such questions as the Orthodox schism or the evangelization of new peoples beyond the oceans. Yet in his judgment, "it is true, and remains true, that the Council of Trent is the greatest reform council in the history of the Church" 202.

In fact, penetrating research reveals with increasing clarity the limits, failures, and delays of Tridentine reformism 203. Yet the newer and more nuanced apologetics of scholars such as John O'Malley seems unwilling to take account of it. More than half a century later, O'Malley does not hesitate to repeat the Silesian historian's judgment almost word for word, without altering either its form or substance, asserting that the reform decrees promulgated in 1562-63 "under the brilliant leadership of Cardinal Giovanni Morone" - decrees that in his view dealt almost exclusively with bishops and pastors - made Trent the greatest reform council in the history of the Church 204. One of the first to doubt that this was so was Master

Pasquino. To Marforio's question, "After all the uproar | raised at Trent, | Pasquin, what was decided?" he answered that everything remained "as usual"; as for the long-awaited reform of the Church, he advised silence: "Hush! It seems to be asleep" 205. No more than the quip of an embittered courtier, certainly; but the fact remains that this allegedly foundational council of a new Church wholly dedicated to the *salus animarum* inspired neither iconographic celebration 206 nor historical commemoration in a Roman curia that was nevertheless discovering in art and erudition extraordinarily effective instruments for constructing a new image of itself and its history. The manuscript of the *Acta concilii tridentini*, on which Gabriele Paleotti - one of the protagonists of the final conciliar convocation - had worked for years with Morone's and Borromeo's approval, remained unpublished at his death after receiving criticism, censorship, and exhortations to the utmost caution from authoritative figures. The "only history of the council, and not merely a diary or chronicle, written by a contemporary" therefore remained buried in the archives until the nineteenth century 207, proof of the Church's difficulty in coming to terms with that experience - with its conflicts, outcomes, manipulations, and betrayals. Consequently, the first person to reconstruct the Council of Trent's history in detail from original sources, more than fifty years after its conclusion, and to raise the problem of its historical meaning was a fierce adversary of the papal Church, Paolo Sarpi. From the outset he made explicit the conclusion reached by his work in the famous judgment that the long and troubled episcopal assembly had laid the foundations for "the greatest deformation that has ever existed since the Christian name has lived" and for the unlimited imposition of Roman and papal "totality" over the Church that remained Catholic 208.

In reality, much did change in the first decades of post-Tridentine Rome, though not in the manner many council fathers would have wished, at least at the level of individual and collective sensibilities and conduct. This was due not only to the hierarchical strengthening of the ecclesiastical institution, its recovered doctrinal compactness, and the militant spirit with which it equipped itself, but above all to a new religious atmosphere that seemed to spread through the body of the Church. The Roman curia was forced, at least in part and for a time, to alter its habits, as the Venetian ambassador Giacomo Soranzo emphasized in his report of 1565, identifying some structural causes. In his view, if the papal court was no longer what it had once been, this was because the Reformation had removed an enormous number of ecclesiastical benefices from Roman appetites; because the incomes of bishops and cardinals had been sharply reduced and limited to a single diocese; and because the residence requirement was emptying the curia. Moreover, there was no longer "any prince who gives them presents or benefices, as Emperor Charles and the crown of France once did so generously; now not only do neither of them give any more, but they forbid that further cardinals be made from among their subjects." For this reason too one could no longer say "that this or that cardinal is imperial, another of the French faction, and another Spanish, because once the gifts that were the true causes of these passions ceased, these dependencies ceased as well" 209. But old habits would not take long to reassert themselves, perhaps no longer sustained by distant dioceses and abbeys but by more discreet pensions charged against their revenues, as the pomp, splendor, and waste of sumptuous Baroque Rome would demonstrate.

6. Giovanni Morone and Carlo Borromeo

As a new model of prelate emerged, wholly inspired by devout piety, charitable zeal, scrupulous orthodoxy, and devotional fervor, the role Carlo Borromeo came to assume within the Roman curia itself was decisive. The nephew of Pius IV soon rose to become the venerable icon of the post-Tridentine bishop and Counter-Reformation sanctity. When he arrived in Rome after his uncle's election to receive the red hat, not yet twenty-two and "not of a sound constitution" 210, he had not appeared remarkable either for exceptional gifts or religious zeal. The pope's trust in this "extremely cold person, with little experience of worldly affairs," always afraid of contradicting him or making a mistake, therefore aroused some astonishment, as Mocenigo judged in 1560, though he considered him "good-natured" 211. Three years later another Venetian resident described him as a prelate "of fairly sound judgment but very slow intelligence," revealing "goodwill rather than the spirit needed to sustain so great a burden" 212. Nor did Borromeo appear overly troubled by adapting himself to the custom of accumulating wealth through offices, benefices, and prebends

of every sort - he had received his first abbey *in commendam* in 1545, at the age of seven - including the archdiocese of Milan and the legations of Bologna and Romagna. In a short time he became “a very rich cardinal” 213.

In 1565 Giacomo Soranzo presented him to the Venetian Senate as a powerful and respected man to whom “all ambassadors, all cardinals, and everyone in need of anything whatever” addressed themselves. He was “the head of all congregations convened on any subject whatsoever,” and scrupulously reported their work to the pope, like a secretary of state “already so versed in all affairs that, just as he is most patient in every audience, so he dispatches every matter with ease” 214. What struck Soranzo most, however, was the genuine religious conversion Borromeo underwent beginning at the end of 1562, after the death of his brother Federico and against the background of the council’s final convocation. In June 1563 he finally decided to be ordained a priest and shortly afterward a bishop, until he seemed to have embraced “almost a Theatine life.” This new manner of living, reflected also in the halving of his household; the sudden religious zeal expressed in fasting, prayer, meditation, and spiritual exercises; and the devout clerics with whom he surrounded himself induced the pope - always suspicious of his predecessor’s disciples and convinced that they sought “revenues and goods more than the holiness they display outwardly” - to urge him “to abandon the close association he maintained with those Theatines, and to order them under penalty not to associate with him,” as was reported in April 1564 215. The Theatines and especially the Jesuits were in fact his spiritual guides. In their school he developed the religious ardor that led him to transform his life into a testimony of faith, personal self-denial, and charity in the service of others 216.

Yet, as has been observed, it would be mistaken to see in the young cardinal-nephew’s change of direction only renewed religious spirit. No less important was his clear distancing from the pope, who was irritated by his new orientation and did not refrain from criticizing and sometimes mocking him 217. Borromeo, for his part, chose his new mentors and masters among his uncle’s fiercest opponents. He openly criticized the pope’s theological leniency toward Protestants and his distancing from most Catholic Spain, to the point of ceasing to speak to him. This did not prevent him, partly because both men were Milanese, from maintaining cordial correspondence with Morone, though the relationship grew progressively more detached after the urgent and turbulent months in which the council had finally been concluded. One may perhaps suppose that Morone himself played some part in the young Borromeo’s political maturation. A letter from Facchetto of 19 July 1561 suggests as much, reporting that Morone customarily went “once or twice every week to the pope and is always well received,” although he tried “to withdraw as far as possible from business and leave matters to Cardinal Borromeo, who is by now trained in the affairs of the papacy.” He sought to avoid appearing continually in the foreground - “everyone greatly praises this withdrawal” - even though the principal foreign ambassadors in Rome often came to consult him “on every affair” 218. What chiefly emerges from their letters, in fact, is a host of minor matters still strongly marked by a pre-conciliar atmosphere: recommendations, benefices, pensions, dispensations, favors, and exemptions for themselves and their protégés, especially in view of Borromeo’s role as Major Penitentiary, the various religious orders placed under their protection, and the dense network of patronage surrounding them 219.

On 20 November 1563 Giulio Poggiano wrote to Cardinal Otto Truchsess that nothing and no one was more virtuous, pious, and devoted to study - especially theology - than Borromeo, praising his frequent reception of the sacraments and his association with the Jesuits 220. That same year the Venetian ambassador extolled his “most innocent life, so that, as far as anyone knows, he may be said to be free from every stain,” offering everyone a shining example of rigorous religious discipline: “This must certainly be attributed to the great praise of His Most Illustrious Lordship, who, being in the flower of youth, the nephew of a pope and in such high favor with him, surrounded by so many comforts and in a court where objects of pleasure of every kind are not lacking, nevertheless leads so exemplary and honorable a life.” Added to this was his inclination “toward letters,” so that “all the time left to him […] is spent in study and in the company of many virtuous and spiritual gentlemen who gather almost every evening in his chambers” 221. Two years later Soranzo’s successor portrayed him as an ascetic worn down “by studies, fasts, vigils, and other abstinences,” who had become “so devoted to sacred learning that it is a rare thing in our time,” despite the pope - very different

from him - urging him “to live well but not so severely.” “His life,” the ambassador added, “is most innocent and most chaste; he says Mass on every feast day, fasts very often, and in all things lives with such religion that he gives a singular example to everyone, so that one may rightly say that he alone brings more benefit to the court of Rome than all the decrees of the council together.” The court did not love him, because it “would prefer a freer life, as has ordinarily been followed, and complains that he is not naturally generous, either in asking favors from His Holiness or in giving from his own resources” 222. Yet it had no choice but to accommodate - at least outwardly - the new devotional climate, symbolically expressed in the requirement that his household dress in black velvet, while the household itself was soon reduced in size and stripped of all pomp. This did not prevent Pasquinade satire from attacking him for the lavish ecclesiastical revenues he enjoyed: “Borromeo, you who play the great saint | and want other men’s goods dispensed | in God’s service, why do you keep | your own for yourself? That is against reason” 223.

These were also the years in which Bonsignore Cacciaguerra moved through Rome, the “holy pilgrim” as he later presented himself in his narcissistic autobiography. It reflects the new Counter-Reformation models of devotion and sanctity, composed of charitable self-denial and ascetic self-punishment, sexual obsessions and contempt for the body, constant recourse to the sacraments and visits to the sick and hospitals, miracles and visions, rosaries and prayers, cults of saints and paid Masses, indulgences and relics, devout fervors and absolute fidelity to the Church, apologetic commitment and tormenting scruples about sin, devils always ready to undermine good intentions, and guardian angels always ready to dispense sound advice 224. These were the years in which Filippo Neri founded the Congregation of the Oratory, nourished by new religious energies, devotional fervor, and charitable engagement, within which the future cardinal Cesare Baronio was serving his apprenticeship. Even the papal curia that Aurelio Porcelaga had described in flattering terms in October 1561 225 now appeared very different 226:

Life at court is therefore very modest, partly because of poverty, […] and perhaps no less because of the good example set by Cardinal Borromeo, for peoples become what they see their princes to be. The cardinal, in whose hands all dispatches lie, lives as religiously and withdrawn as I have said and shows himself generous and beneficent only toward those who resemble him. Thus no cardinal or other courtier can hope for any favor unless he lives either in fact, or at least in appearance, as Borromeo does. They have therefore withdrawn completely, at least in public, from every kind of pleasure. Cardinals are no longer seen masked, on horseback, or riding through Rome in carriages with women, as was customary not long ago; they scarcely even ride alone in closed coaches. Banquets, gaming, hunting, liveries, and every other visible luxury have entirely ceased, all the more because no lay person of distinction now lives at court, whereas many once did, whether relatives or dependents of the popes. Priests all wear clerical dress, so that reform is clearly visible in men’s appearance. On the other hand, this also means that artisans and merchants may be said to have gone bankrupt, since money circulates for no purpose.

Shortly afterward, in September 1565, before Pius IV’s already imminent death and while the Ottoman fleet brought the threatening siege of Malta to an end, Carlo Borromeo moved permanently to Milan to govern the diocese in person, in accordance with Tridentine norms. Until his death in 1584, he would labor there with indefatigable authoritarian zeal, aided by the extensive powers granted him by Rome, to put the conciliar decrees into practice; to impose on the faithful the norms and conduct of an austere faith; to assert harshly the primacy of the Church and its ministers and claim their jurisdictional prerogatives; to employ an iron fist in crushing opposition and resistance, protecting orthodoxy and extirpating surviving heresy, and combating popular superstition. Immediately after the council’s conclusion he had already expressed the desire that attention now be devoted to translating its norms into the actual reality of religious and pastoral life, “as all Christendom needs, and no longer to disputing” 227.

His experience also gave rise to an iconographic tradition that became especially widespread in the Po Valley. In it the saint at prayer and fasting, in meditation and ecstatic rapture, alternates and overlaps with the bishop of unmistakable aquiline nose, always wrapped in cardinalitial robes and always intent on instructing his clergy, welcoming Jesuits, Theatines, and Barnabites into his diocese, preaching to his flock, administering the sacraments, teaching Christian doctrine to children, caring for plague victims, assisting the

poor, combating worldly vanity and dissipation, visiting parishes, celebrating provincial and diocesan synods, founding monasteries, establishing or reforming confraternities, imposing use of the confessional, spreading Eucharistic devotion and the cult of the Virgin and saints, taking part in rites and processions, venerating relics, founding Sacred Mountains, and undertaking pious pilgrimages to the Holy House of Loreto or the Shroud of Turin 228. His rapid canonization in 1610 also made possible the celebration of the great miracles and glorious heavenly ascent of this bishop 229. His sanctity seemed to bring to an end a long season of denunciations of absenteeism, greed, ignorance, and corruption among the clergy and their pastors, creating the enduring post-Tridentine exemplar that took from him the name Borromean piety. Rooted in Milan and Lombardy, it was destined to spread throughout the Catholic Church and endure for centuries.

In the 1560s and 1570s Giovanni Morone and Carlo Borromeo collaborated and debated over important aspects of their shared curial and diocesan commitments. The administration of the Apostolic Penitentiary, for example, was frequently present in their correspondence from November 1565, when Morone congratulated Borromeo on his appointment as Major Penitentiary, an office he held until 1572, overseeing the reform desired by Pius V in 1569 after Pius IV's partial attempt of 1562. It is possible that under Pope Medici Morone regarded reform of the Penitentiary as an instrument for balancing the power of the Holy Office. But in the difficult circumstances of Pius V's pontificate, the common ground between him and Borromeo regarding the dicastery lay in their firm determination to defend episcopal authority and end the scandal of favors purchased in Rome by corrupt clerics. In an April 1566 letter, the archbishop of Milan revealed that the Penitentiary was his chief concern. "There is nothing in Rome that weighs on me as much, nor that should reasonably weigh on me as much, as the Penitentiary," he wrote, and in a subsequent letter expressed his intention to improve the training of confessors by introducing lessons in the humanities, logic, and sacred Scripture. To this end Morone himself proposed employing in the secret tribunal several men attached to him: Monsignor Pietro Malombra, whom his recommendation had introduced into Borromeo's household; the Bolognese auditor of the Rota Giacomo Grati; and his fellow citizen Alessandro Musotti, a relative of the Bolognese senator Cesare Bianchetti, formerly a defense witness for the Milanese cardinal 230.

The correspondence between the two Milanese cardinals naturally also contained a multitude of small matters concerning the government of the Ambrosian Church. From Rome, Morone took an interest in them not only as protector of several religious orders, but because of his personal ties to relatives, friends, and clients who likewise moved in Borromeo's orbit, among them members of the Gallarati, Stampa, and Botta families 231. It is impossible to examine in detail this mass of recommendations, requests for assistance and favors, and proposed dispensations, some of which also concerned the diocese of Modena, to which Morone again held title in these years, or requests to protect Paolo Sadoleto's diocese of Carpentras from rebels and heretics or favor the Benedictines of San Paolo fuori le Mura 232. It may at least be observed, however, that many of these appeals revolved around the residence of the secular clergy and the closely connected question of administering ecclesiastical benefices and their revenues. This sensitive issue, already central to Tridentine debates and reform efforts, was played out in Milan as in Modena on the practical ground of managing income - pensions, commendams, curial offices - held or controlled by the two ordinaries. It revealed the fragility of the council's practical impact on the behavior of its own leading protagonists. One example concerned the revenues of the abbey of San Silvestro at Nonantola. As commendatory abbot, Borromeo hesitated to allow Morone to use them, even though the latter intended to strengthen the income of the Modenese seminary and thus implement one of the cornerstones of Tridentine reform. Only after his colleague's pressing requests did the archbishop of Milan order in 1566 that the matter be settled according to Morone's wishes 233.

Another case occupying extensive space in their correspondence concerned a member of Morone's household, the already familiar Pier Luigi Fedeli, canon of the Milanese collegiate church of San Nazaro in Brolo and at the same time administrator of the Fabric of Saint Peter, of which the cardinal was protector. Despite Borromeo's insistence, Morone succeeded in enforcing his collaborator's absence with persuasive arguments, including the claim that divine worship was not impaired "if the church is well served, and

Messer Pier Luigi supports from his own resources - something no other canon is known to do - a worthy priest who serves that church in his place." Even in the final years of Pius V's pontificate, when Fedeli was forced to return to residence, the two cardinals continued to negotiate his presence in Rome for limited periods, and Morone never ceased pressing for extensions 234. When, to give another example, the archbishop of Milan began with the cathedral in an effort to remove noble tombs suspended from church walls, as the first Milanese provincial council had decreed in 1565, he had Morone urged to authorize work on his father's monument in Santa Maria della Scala. The cardinal did not reply 235.

The two bishops naturally also confronted each other directly on matters concerning the government of their respective dioceses. This is shown, among other things, by the transmission to the bishop of Modena in 1566 and 1571 of the acts of Milan's first provincial council, together with Borromeo's explicit acknowledgment that in 1566 he had drawn "in many matters" on the text of the synod Morone had convened the previous year. Morone nevertheless expressed considerable doubt about the effectiveness of the rigid reforming action his colleague had carried out too hastily in Milan 236. Their discussion also developed into shared reflection on the desirability of supporting the Oratorians, who were active, among other places, in the confraternity of San Girolamo della Carità, which Borromeo knew to be under Morone's "protection." It continued in Morone's assistance to the Borromeo College then being founded at Pavia, reciprocated by the assignment of places to members of his circle, including a brother of Girolamo Confalonieri, vicar to Morone's nephew Girolamo Gallarati, bishop of Sutri 237.

The dramatic subject of criminal misconduct among regular clergy further complicated the debate between the two cardinals and was frequently the object of consultation. Matters ranged from Morone's support for Borromeo's decision to suppress the congregation of the Humiliati after the arquebus shot fired at him in October 1569, to various occasions when support had to be secured from Rome to punish monks who were untouchable because protected by their superiors. The case of a Milanese Olivetan "caught in the house of a public woman and brought here dressed as a layman, indeed as a soldier" could thus become an opportunity to point to the bishops' limited powers despite the Tridentine legislation and the resulting impossibility of carrying out a serious reform of the regular clergy 238. This was yet another sign of the halting, if not failed, implementation of conciliar prescriptions by a Church increasingly hardened in its strenuous defense of Roman centralism.

Chapter Twenty-One

Pius V, “A Most Fierce Persecutor of Heretics”

1. From Pius IV to Pius V

Pius IV died on 9 December 1565. After solemn obsequies in Saint Peter’s, his body was transferred for burial to Santa Maria degli Angeli “without any pomp” 1, accompanied by Pasquinade invectives against the ruthless taxation with which he had financed his numerous building projects 2. He nevertheless left the papal treasury well supplied 3, together with the precious legacy of the council’s conclusion and a Rome in which, despite the thoroughly Renaissance magnificence with which he had sought to leave an indelible mark of his “pious” and “angelic” pontificate, the austere atmosphere of the Counter-Reformation was beginning to be felt. The new Tridentine spirit and Europe’s political transformations help explain why the curial balance now swung back toward the rigorist party. Its members wished to combine renewed assertion of Roman primacy with revived religious and devotional fervor, polemical engagement along confessional frontiers, and an unrelenting struggle against heresy even south of the Alps. It was once again the moment of the zealots, of the inquisitors forced into retreat by the defeats and humiliations suffered in the early 1560s, yet capable of enduring, preserving intact and even strengthening the Holy Office’s capillary network. They could now reassert their indispensable role in directing implementation of the Tridentine canons along the rails of the strictest orthodoxy, instilling a new spirit of obedience and militancy, regaining control of consciences, and suppressing every kind of doctrinal deviation.

Before the *extra omnes*, Morone urged all his colleagues to respect Pius IV’s 1562 bull on papal elections. He recalled that among the abuses of Rome against which he had always heard protests in Germany and at Trent, “one of the principal ones was […] the manner followed in creating the pope […], where it seemed that every other thing was sought before the honor of God” 4. Conflicts were not lacking, but despite anxieties beforehand the conclave ended after two weeks in a surprise election 5. “Highly esteemed for the things he had done at the council” and strong in imperial support, Morone was among the leading candidates, even though, as the Venetian ambassador had emphasized some time before, “his having been imprisoned by the Inquisition, even though acquitted, will always create great opposition against him” 6. Many shared this judgment, including Philip II himself. The king included Morone among his candidates only so as not to contradict earlier nominations, following advice given in January 1565 by the ambassador in Rome, Don Luis de Requesens, in a portrait of the Sacred College rich in penetrating and often ferocious observations. The Spanish monarch himself had requested it in order to establish the policy to follow during the coming vacancy and avoid a repetition of earlier failures such as the election of Paul IV, “so holy a cardinal” who then became “so turbulent a pope” that he had shaken and set all Christendom ablaze, or bitter surprises such as Pius IV, regarded before the conclave as the Catholic king’s “vassal and creature” 7. Morone’s exemplary life, intellectual gifts, unparalleled experience in handling affairs, and prestige were fully acknowledged, as were his long-standing devotion to the House of Austria and his gratitude for Philip II’s assistance while he was imprisoned, although in recent times there had been signs of resentment “because he had not been rewarded as much as he believes he deserves.”

Requesens, however, also expressed profound distrust of Morone and above all reopened the question of his trial, raising doubts about the legitimacy of the hasty acquittal pronounced by Pius IV. To clarify his thoughts, he had spoken with Cardinals Carpi and Alessandrino, both inquisitors and sworn enemies of Morone but in his judgment “the two most zealous men” in all Rome. “Carpi always remained suspicious of him,” he reported, while Alessandrino, despite having signed the acquittal, had told him bluntly that he had no doubt that the doctrines Morone professed in the past were heretical. Requesens therefore advised against supporting in any way the papal election of a man irreparably “tainted in religion,” whose uncommon abilities made him all the more dangerous 8. Once the gesture of including him among the Catholic king’s candidates had been made - a necessary gesture, since Morone had been nominated in the past and dropping

him now would have been unbecoming - they should dissimulate and deny him any real support 9, directing it instead toward Cardinal Ghislieri. Ghislieri was a morally irreproachable man of great religious zeal, although Requesens thought his election unlikely because the other cardinals regarded him as severe and wanted a pope who would be “a good companion” 10.

Following this line, on the very day of Pius IV’s death a Spanish agent wrote to Gonzalo Pérez that Morone was being discussed because Philip II had named him in the past, because he was an authoritative figure, and because - it was said - he was Farnese’s friend. But his imprisonment for heresy and his support for allowing the laity communion under both species and permitting priests to marry discredited him 11. On 20 December Cardinal Pacheco warned Philip II that Morone was among those who, “according to popular report, are running in the race,” though Cardinal Ippolito d’Este fiercely opposed him and reproached him for “the previous trial, the concession of the chalice, and his inclination to permit marriage” 12. Ten days later Requesens wrote that the duke of Florence too acknowledged the Milanese cardinal’s many good qualities and devotion to Spain, but again evoked the suspicions that undermined his candidacy and gave his enemies an opening to attack him. But for these suspicions he would have had no rival, though many feared his election and rejoiced at his exclusion.

Only the cardinals created by Pius IV, the “Pian creatures” 13, remained in his support, and not all of them wholeheartedly 14, together with the emperor, whose ambassador “has done everything for Morone,” Paolo Tiepolo wrote on 15 December 15. This support was explained by the cardinal’s long-standing Habsburg allegiance and especially by the fact that he had obtained permission for communion *sub utraque* and had promised the emperor clerical marriage if elected pope - something the Spanish ambassador found inadmissible 16. Philip II himself was convinced of it. In an autograph addition to the letter he sent Requesens on 21 December, he expressed all his doubts about Morone’s suitability for the present circumstances, “because of the matters you know have occurred, and for others as well.” He therefore decided to prevent his election, but to act with the utmost secrecy 17. Such views were widely shared in Rome, where the old accusations began to circulate once again, “diabolical exceptions of heresy,” as someone wrote immediately after the conclave began 18. The Pasquinade writers too dreaded the election of the Milanese cardinal “because he is so great a vessel of heresy,” or appealed to the “Father in heaven” to ensure “that the pope now to be made | not be Cardinal Morone, stained with heresy,” “the double-dealing arch-deceiver” ready “to entangle himself with papalists” merely to ascend the throne 19. Still more explicit was a poem that significantly summoned the ghost of Reginald Pole 20:

Will you be so blind and such rogues, enemies of God and void of judgment, as to make Morone pope as well, foe of the Virgin and the saints? Do you not know, you madmen all, that he holds an evil opinion in faith, that he nearly sang the sermon, companion of England and of others such?

When the papal obsequies were over, the doors of the conclave closed on the evening of 20 December behind forty-eight cardinals; in the following days their number rose to fifty-three, more than half of them created by Pius IV. In those days some even regarded Morone as a “pope already made,” thanks to the emperor’s “most vigorous efforts” on his behalf 21 and the support of Carlo Borromeo, who favored his immediate election by adoration 22.

Capable of looking ahead, Morone sought above all - unsuccessfully - to prevent the election of a pope openly hostile to him. To this end he pressured Borromeo, “who, like a Theatine, had renounced control of the votes devoted to him,” and convinced him to enter the contest by warning that otherwise he would be “the cause that, like lost sheep, [the cardinals] would sell themselves either to Ferrara or to Farnese, whichever offered them more.” In any case, the anonymous informant of the king of Spain concluded, “in these first assaults every effort will be made to bring Morone through, and Borromeo is confident of it” 23. But the initiative was immediately thwarted by a substantial group of hostile cardinals. “Paul IV’s creatures are maneuvering against Morone,” Cardinal Marcantonio Bobba wrote to the Savoyard court, fearing that “the charge made against him in the time of the said pope may harm him, even though he was acquitted” 24. Borromeo himself had to retreat after seeing that “a union was being formed against him” and that “those who do not want him are almost all the noblest and most lordly, and their minds grow harder against him

each time and many have become estranged," including Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo of Trent, "in whom Morone trusted above all others," while the Catholic king now supported only Cardinal Alessandrino's candidacy 25.

Shortly after Christmas Madrid was informed that the Milanese cardinal was trying "to put his campaign to sleep, but he cannot succeed, because they wish to keep it alive despite him," although he could now be considered "entirely crushed and desperate" 26. From the outset, partly because of the arrogance with which it was advanced, Borromeo's proposal to elect Morone by adoration had aroused the strongest resistance. As soon as the doors of the Sistine Chapel closed, a "great commotion" was heard, and someone was heard shouting that he would never vote for a heretic. "Because of the rumors circulating about him, […] maneuvers against him had already begun," the Venetian ambassador wrote on 20 December. He was able to report that in the conclave Ghislieri had made "vigorous efforts, crying out that they wished to make pope a man who not long before had been in Castel Sant'Angelo for heresy, from which he had been removed by grace and not by justice, and that he too had things which, if the matter were examined more calmly, he would show and use to make his guilt known" 27. From the first moment it was open war, as a contemporary Roman newsletter reported 28:

He did not see how in good conscience one could incline one's mind toward Morone, knowing that there was a trial for heresy against him in which certain charges were not lacking that, had they been properly sifted and due knowledge of the case been obtained, would not have resulted in so easy an acquittal as the hasty one pronounced at the beginning of this past pontificate. And merely to have been suspected of heresy was by law enough to exclude him from the papacy, as he offered to demonstrate with books in hand and with the trial papers that he said he carried there in his bosom. He added that he had other things to say. When he was told that Paul IV had prosecuted him because he bore him ill will, he replied that if Paul IV had investigated him for heresy out of hatred, Pius IV had likewise acquitted him *nulla habita causae cognitione* because he loved him too much. It is therefore thought that this greatly weakened Morone's plans and hopes.

The strategy Paul IV had effectively employed in 1549 and 1555 was thus repeated: the inquisitorial evidence was carried into the conclave to exclude his adversaries from the papal throne. In vain, moreover, at the height of his prestige and on the eve of the council's conclusion, the Milanese cardinal had sought to recover certain documents relating to the trial. Ghislieri himself refused, replying with arrogance bordering on mockery that Morone need not worry, since in the archives of the Holy Office "the papers are kept in the greatest security" 29. Confirming that these were not mere rumors, an informer of the duke of Este wrote on 22 December that the conclave once again echoed with memories of the trial, which "it is held for certain [Cardinal Alessandrino] continually carries in his pocket" 30. A report sent at the time to Parma agreed 31:

On Thursday after Mass […] the word went out that they wished to adore Cardinal Morone and that Cardinal Alessandrino had exposed him. […] All night there was an uproar over Morone, for Paul IV's seven creatures remained and remain most vigilant and oppose him openly, and some say Cardinal Ferrara is also against him. Paul IV's men have carried into the conclave the trial conducted against him for heresy. Morone's supporters say that the same judges who condemned him also acquitted him; but the Paulines do not say so, for he was acquitted only by a bull of Pius IV. Yesterday morning I spoke with the emperor's ambassador, who told me […] that he was very sorry the College of Cardinals wished to brand as a heretic a cardinal who had brought the council to a close, that the peoples would take it very badly, and that they ought simply not to give him their vote rather than say such things. He also told me that they accuse him of being vindictive, too severe, and of favoring communion under both species and the marriage of priests. He said the cardinal bore no blame for any of this and had never been vindictive, for when the Carafas were prisoners he never spoke against them.

The Milanese cardinal's chance of reaching the tiara finally vanished on the morning of the twenty-third, when he fell five votes short of the thirty-four required. By unanimous judgment he behaved on that occasion with "remarkable constancy" and "the greatest prudence and dissimulation," betraying no desire to be elected and indeed "showing the contrary" 32. On 29 December Roman newsletters reported that everyone considered Morone "most virtuous" and that until then he had "created more stir than anyone else, but for the

past three days it seems his exclusion has become known and it may be regarded as certain that he will not become pope" 33.

During the following week the candidacies of Alessandro Farnese, Giovanni Ricci, and Guglielmo Sirleto also rapidly collapsed, until on 7 January Farnese and Borromeo reached agreement on Ghislieri, strongly supported by Philip II. Requesens immediately informed the king of Cardinal Alessandrino's surprising election, saying that in his opinion Ghislieri deserved it more than anyone else and concluding that if he did not prove a good pope, no hope could ever be placed in anyone 34. On 11 January he repeated that the choice could have fallen on no one more suited "to the times in which we live" 35. The Catholic king shared this judgment. In a letter of 25 January to Pedro Guerrero, archbishop of Granada, who had distinguished himself at Trent by his reforming zeal, Philip declared himself convinced that the election had been guided by the Holy Spirit, "since he is the man he is: of exemplary life, wise, zealous, learned, pious, as one desires and as the difficult times require for the good government of the universal Church and the welfare of all Christendom" 36. Tiepolo was less enthusiastic. Writing on 12 January, he said that just as the election "occurred contrary to everyone's belief and general expectation, so it brought great novelty and astonishment to those who learned of it, and to the Romans especially incredible displeasure, for it almost seemed to them that Paul IV, who had been so hated, had risen again." In his view, the outcome was due to Borromeo's foolishness: he "entered the conclave almost as its master, acting as though everything had to depend on him and resolving, once Morone was excluded, to accept no pope except one of his own men." The result was that in the end "he found himself having made pope a creature of Paul IV, whose nephews had been put to death by his uncle Pope Pius, and a mortal enemy of Morone, his principal man" 37.

2. "God Has Raised Paul IV from the Dead for Us"

The man who ascended the chair of Peter was therefore a humble friar, born in 1504 in an obscure village near Alessandria, Bosco, "of the lowest blood […] and afterward raised in poverty," as Camillo Capilupi wrote 38 (plate 6): a "poor keeper of sheep" now become "general shepherd over all the shepherds of Christ's flock" 39. He himself proudly claimed his humble origins and the divine mission with which he felt invested. Its first aim was to restore the power of the Holy Office as the cardinal instrument of Church government and exclude every concession to Lutherans. Immediately after his election Pius V told Maximilian II's ambassador that he wished to grant the emperor every "honorable favor, but let him not ask for clerical marriage or similar things, because he will never obtain them from him" 40. His entire life and career had unfolded in the service of the Holy Office, as the imperial resident emphasized in a dispatch of 2 February 1566. "Since he has been an inquisitor all his life, he proceeds along that road," Requesens wrote on 18 March 41. Entering a Dominican convent at a very young age, he had taken vows in 1521 at seventeen. His reputation as a theologian was consolidated through long teaching of philosophy and theology at Pavia, where he had also served as inquisitor. In 1550 he moved in the same capacity to Como and then Bergamo, before being called to Rome in 1551 to succeed Fra Teofilo Scullica as commissary general of the Holy Office 42.

Ghislieri was "loved beyond measure" by Cardinal Teatino, "who prized his virtue above that of all others" and admired his zeal "in preserving the faith and extirpating heretics." Carafa gave him lodging in his palace, where "very often they remained withdrawn together for very long periods" 43. After becoming Paul IV, Carafa entrusted him with direction of the most important trials, granting him the same powers as the cardinal inquisitors over everyone, *etiam in dignitate ecclesiastica* 44. Though he made him bishop of Sutri and Nepi in September 1556 and raised him to the cardinalate less than a year later, this did not prevent the "terrible old man" 45 from sometimes accusing him of excessive mildness and treating him harshly. He even insulted him as "unworthy" of the purple and as "an unfrocked Lutheran friar" 46, publicly rebuking him with a "great scolding and torrent of words" 47 that "from nothing we have made you what you are" 48. It was as though the ascetic Dominican had not always been animated by indefatigable orthodox zeal, as is evident, for example, from the principles he stated during the repression of the Apulian Waldensians in 1563-64: a "wicked man who is gravely indicted and refuses to tell the truth" must be considered only "a bad bone

to gnaw"; "it has always been and remains the nature of heretics to proceed fraudulently and deceive Catholics"; and "the person of the confessor is one thing, that of the judge another: the confessor believes everything told him; the judge always suspects the defendant of withholding the truth" 49.

On the basis of these iron convictions Fra Michele spared neither energy nor total devotion in the struggle against heresy. "The necessity of the Holy Office lies as close to my heart as my own heart," he had written to Alessandro Farnese on 8 July 1559 50. For this reason, despite his aristocratic impatience and virulent fits of rage, Paul IV placed complete trust in him and on 14 December 1558 appointed him *summus inquisitor* 51, thereby creating a new office and title that the same "great Pius V" 52 would later abolish. "As for the affairs of the Inquisition, everyone firmly believes that he, according to his custom, will be not only severe but rigorous and formidable," Tiepolo wrote on 12 January 1566 53. The pontificate of Pius IV had been for him years of bitterness and marginalization, for the pope lost no opportunity to display profound hostility toward him 54. The acquittals of Carnesecchi, Sanfelice, and Foscarari; the annulment of the trial against Morone and the latter's appointment to preside over the council, like other figures not free of suspicion such as Seripando and Gonzaga, had given an unmistakable sign of the new course Pius IV imposed on papal policy. These were bitter draughts for the supreme inquisitor Fra Michele Ghislieri, who had been compelled not only to conceal his certainty regarding Morone's heresies but also to sign his acquittal 55. Once elected, however, he chose the name Pius V in gratitude for Borromeo's unexpected support in conclave.

The election of this austere and devout friar closed one age and defined a new historical divide after the conclusion of Trent. The fading of the last Renaissance gleams was symbolically reflected in the return of a friar to the papal throne, something almost unthinkable only a few years earlier. Indeed, when Cosimo de' Medici received the news he began "to laugh and make jokes" 56. According to the Florentine ambassador Averardo Serristori, Ghislieri would have wished to withdraw if the papacy "could have fallen to a reasonable person, but he saw matters so disposed that he feared it might come to Morone or another such person, with great harm to this Holy See" 57. There can be little doubt that Cardinal Pacheco too had Morone in mind when, in a letter of 7 January 1566 to Philip II, he attributed the unexpected outcome to the Holy Spirit. It was all the more astonishing because "many who, when they entered the conclave, would have cut off their legs rather than make Cardinal Alessandrino pope […] rushed among the first to vote for him" 58. A few days later he insisted that what chiefly barred the way to the Milanese cardinal was the fear "concerning matters of religion" felt by many, especially Paul IV's cardinals 59. On 1 May he observed that having come within a step of the tiara and then been excluded definitively closed the path for the future as well to this man of great prudence and experience. The trial he had undergone under Paul IV would always weigh on him, and many continued to ask whether it had been justified or not 60.

Pius V was crowned on 17 January 1566, his sixty-second birthday, and by an irony of fate - in the absence of the indisposed dean of the college - it was Morone who placed the tiara on his head 61. The new pope immediately showed himself hostile to all display. In the future he would refrain from celebrating the anniversary of his election with the customary banquet, ordering instead a substantial alms to convents and monasteries. On the very day after this "miraculous" election, a true "revolution" in Beccadelli's eyes 62, he made it plain that under his government there would be a return to the past. Paul IV's men, those who like Ghislieri had been forced to bow their heads and endure, were the first to rejoice and in many cases to recover important roles and functions under a pope determined to resume the battle against heretics, irresponsibly abandoned if not actually betrayed by Pius IV. "He gathers up and embraces all Paul IV's creatures," a newsletter of 12 January 1566 reported. Rome, it added, was seized with fear on learning of the election of this friar, convinced that the supreme authority invested in him had the sole purpose of "guiding men to heaven," as he himself said, chiefly by combating "the malice of perverse heretics" 63.

Within a short time many of Pius IV's collaborators were dismissed and "all Carafa's creatures exalted" in their place 64. Only a few days after the conclave, Antonio Carafa, marquis of Montebello, father of Cardinal Alfonso of Naples and author of an *Apologia* for Paul IV 65, was already in Rome, "humanely received by His Holiness" and lodged with Cardinal Scipione Rebiba, now restored to the summit of the Holy Office. The same happened with other relatives and heirs of the dead pope 66. A letter sent at the time

to Giulio Antonio Santoro, who in Naples had devoted himself body and soul to combating heresy and had been accused of plotting to kill Pope Medici “as an enemy of the Carafas,” urged him to come to Rome at once: “What are you waiting for? […] God has raised Paul IV from the dead for us.” Girolamo Rusticucci, Pius V’s secretary, also wrote in the pope’s name to summon him immediately to the curia. Santoro himself would recall that these messages were delivered while he was praying in emotion to give thanks for the election of “so holy and zealous a pastor,” which for him and others ended a painful season of humiliation, bitterness, and impotent rage. Little urging was required. By mid-January Santoro had already hurried “flying” to Rome, where the pope he admired as “all sincerity and all zeal” welcomed him with a generous gift and assigned him “rooms in the palace.” Pius promptly made him consultor of the Holy Office, then archbishop of Santa Severina, and finally cardinal in 1570, entrusting him with the supreme tribunal’s most delicate cases. Santoro would direct it for more than thirty years 67.

It is also significant that one of the new pope’s first initiatives, as reported by a Roman newsletter of 16 February 1566 68, was the construction of a funerary monument for Paul IV’s remains in the chapel built by Oliviero Carafa in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, the Dominican church of the Inquisition. In 1557 Paul IV had elevated it to a cardinalitial title and entrusted it to the newly created Michele Ghislieri, who in turn passed it to his nephew of the same name, whose arms surmount the principal portal and guarantee family continuity in the government of the Roman church, *caput et mater* of the Friars Preacher. Beyond a tribute of admiration and gratitude, Pius V intended the tomb as a tangible sign of political and religious continuity, indicating that doctrinal intransigence and inquisitorial rigor would once again serve as the foundation of the apostolic ministry (plate 2). The tombs of Alfonso Carafa in Naples Cathedral and Rodolfo Pio da Carpi in the church of Trinità dei Monti 69, also commissioned by him, carried the same meaning. They led Tiepolo to observe in 1569 that the austere pope “takes all his pleasure in building tombs for this man and that” 70.

Mindful of the outrages perpetrated in August 1559 against the statue of his venerated predecessor, Pius V ordered the Carafa arms that had then been torn down to be restored throughout Rome. He also commissioned a new bust dedicated *memoriae aeternae Pauli IV* to replace the one destroyed in Saint Peter’s Basilica 71. He further compelled the Capitoline Senate to pay 6,000 scudi for the construction of Pope Carafa’s “most splendid tomb of most precious marbles of various colors,” which was also intended as reparation for that outrage 72. According to a Roman newsletter of 8 December 1566, he wished to place beside it the funerary monument of Paul IV’s nephews and commemorate them with “a solemn office of the dead” 73. Among the first acts of Pius V’s pontificate was in fact a revision of the trial conducted by his predecessor and the rehabilitation of Paul IV’s nephews Alfonso, Carlo, and Giovanni Carafa 74. Besides proclaiming their innocence, annulling Pius IV’s sentence, restoring their property and honors, and returning them “to their former dignity and state,” he restored Antonio Carafa’s canonry at Saint Peter’s and then made him a cardinal in 1568 75. Not content with this, in September 1569 he ordered the arrest, and in 1571 the execution, of Alessandro Pallantieri, who had served as fiscal procurator in that sensational judicial proceeding - under Morone’s discreet supervision - and later became governor of Rome 76. “His head was cut off in the place where the duke of Paliano’s had been cut off,” a Roman newsletter reported 77.

A “noble procession” led by the pope accompanied Paul IV’s body from the humble tomb that had until then received it in Saint Peter’s to the “magnificent” sepulcher of “precious marbles” in Santa Maria sopra Minerva 78. At the end of December 1570 Pius V gave the Minerva friars a substantial sum of money “on condition that those fathers celebrate a sung Mass for the holy memory of Paul IV” 79. As the Theatine Antonio Caracciolo, a devout biographer of Pope Carafa, would recall some decades later, only on the day when Paul IV’s mortal remains were translated to the Dominican basilica did “Rome see religion triumph over impiety, virtue over crimes, truth over calumnies,” amid the great “exultation of all good men” and the afflicted “desolation of the wicked” 80. The vigorous and severe enthroned figure of the old Neapolitan pope with the “fierce gaze” 81, *catholicae pietatis acerrimo propugnatori*, rises imposingly amid the light colors of Filippino Lippi’s frescoes, with the Triumph of Saint Thomas and his victory over heresy at the center of the chapel. In 1567 Pius V would raise Aquinas to the rank of Doctor of the Church as *doctor angelicus*, urge the cardinals to attend an annual Mass on the anniversary of his death, and promote the edition of his *Opera*

omnia, published at Rome in eighteen volumes in 1570-71 82. Soon afterward he also had Thomas represented in the Vatican palaces disputing with “Sabellius, Arius, and Averroes, convicted heretics,” a scene that likewise appears in Lippi’s cycle at the Minerva. By combining the imposing statue of the founder of the Roman Inquisition with the unfailing Thomist magisterium as the doctrinal foundation of the repression of heresy, Pius V also asserted the Dominican primacy in defending the Catholic faith and indicated that his pontificate’s task would be to return the Church to the road traced by Pope Carafa.

Pius V’s total dedication to the struggle against heresy emerges from all his artistic patronage, though it was rather modest in Rome. The projects closest to his heart there were the palace of the Holy Office and enlargement of the prisons of Tor di Nona and the Borgo “because of the great number of prisoners” 83. His principal commission was the fresco decoration of the three papal chapels in the Vatican, entrusted to Giorgio Vasari. In the chapel of Saint Stephen, scenes from the saint’s life celebrated the protomartyr as an exemplar of defending the faith *usque ad effusionem sanguinis*. In the chapel of Saint Peter Martyr, the heroic virtues and miracles of the Dominican preacher killed by Cathar fury were depicted, with the saints of his order welcoming him on the ceiling. On the third floor, finally, the chapel of Saint Michael the Archangel - commander of the heavenly armies, whose name echoed that of the patron - contained a representation of Saint Thomas Aquinas, newly admitted among the Doctors of the Church, refuting the false doctrines of heretics 84. The pope also entrusted Vasari with celebrating the Battle of Lepanto in the Sala Regia and with work on the convent and church dedicated to the Holy Cross “and to all the saints of the Dominican religion” 85 at his native Bosco, projects reflecting his spirit of religious militancy. There he wished to erect his own tomb. Its polychrome marbles depict him wrapped in a purple cope and kneeling before Christ, who rises and blesses him. Between the lateral columns appear the allegories of Faith on the right and Religion on the left, as in the tomb he had erected for Pope Carafa, while above them stands once more his namesake Saint Michael the Archangel, crushing beneath his feet the black and twisted demon 86.

This image also evoked Pius V’s most glorious achievement, the epic battle fought at Lepanto on 7 October 1571, soon surrounded by the aura of miracle, a providential event in which the Virgin’s intercession granted Catholic Europe a crushing victory over the infidel - though the Ottoman perspective was different 87. For the first time since the Tunis expedition of 1535, the suffocating offensive of the Sublime Porte in the Mediterranean had been repelled, proof of divine assistance for the papal crusade against infidels and heretics. Against the background of renewed prophetic ferment, and accompanied by the old pope with continual rosaries, fasts, prayers, alms, and Masses despite his increasingly obvious physical decline, the victory of the fleet led by Don John of Austria was greeted everywhere with rejoicing and solemn *Te Deum*s. A flood of speeches, music, historical accounts, commemorations, poems, songs, and sonnets celebrated what, between metaphor and reality, would become a kind of identity-forming myth of the post-Tridentine Church 88.

3. “He Wants to Make Rome Holy, Which God Grant May Succeed”

“Of a choleric constitution, burned and dry, thin, emaciated, with sunken eyes and entirely white-haired” 89, free of the taste for magnificence and display that had characterized Pope Carafa, Pius V wished to be the first to give an example of severity and asceticism, even threatening excommunication against anyone who dared “alter the broths” on which he lived 90. “He says Mass every day; after Mass he takes a collation: one bread soup and two eggs with half a glass of wine; then he gives audience until evening, when at the twenty-fourth hour he dines on a little meat,” it was reported immediately after his election. As early as 1566 a Roman newsletter stated that the cardinals were forced “to rise before daybreak” to join the pope at morning Mass, while another noted his habit of withdrawing into the papal chapels “in solitary devotion” 91. Shortly before his death, on 10 February 1571, “he held a long

sermon to the cardinals, urging them not to hold incompatible benefices or keep in their households servants who possessed benefices requiring residence; to abstain from banquets and revelry; to wear the rochet; not to go about the city in carriages; not to be seen in any dress other than that of a cardinal; and he gave them other similar good counsels, showing that the times required a change of life and morals" 92. His example also helped spread throughout the papal city such devotional practices as pilgrimages to the ancient Roman basilicas, the Forty Hours, Eucharistic worship, and processions, against the background of renewed activity by lay confraternities. Some contemporaries did in fact judge him a saint, among them Camillo Capilupi, who would describe him as "a truly holy pope, destined to restore this holy see to its ancient dignity" 93. "Blessed be God, who gives a sign that under this holy pope he wishes to aid his little bark in the most tempestuous sea," it was written to Mantua on 1 April 1567 94; and as the body of a saint his corpse was venerated when exposed in Saint Peter's Basilica 95.

Lacking political experience and distrustful of other people's advice, the pope preferred to act "in his own way," sometimes through sudden decisions, convinced that secular princes too should subordinate "everything to the spiritual rather than the temporal," and above all that it was his place "to command almost absolutely in all things," since there was "nothing in the world that does not belong to the Church." If matters did not proceed accordingly, he hurled his spiritual thunderbolts at anyone and everyone 96. His claim that the Church took precedence over every secular authority found its most sensational expression in the bull *In coena Domini* of 10 April 1568, in which the pontiff further enlarged the boundaries of papal jurisdiction and imposed new excommunications, including one against anyone who appealed to a council. Reports from Rome stated that the pontiff was issuing orders to every prince, menacingly brandishing the weapons of religion 97. In the consistory of 23 June 1571 the pope silenced the cardinal of Trent, guilty of suggesting that papal legates should also be sent "to heretical princes," asserting that "it would be less bad to ask aid of infidels than of heretics, since in time one might hope that the former would be brought to the faith, unlike these wicked enemies of the very faith into which they were born" 98. His relations with Emperor Maximilian II were atrocious, while those with Spain and Philip II's Milan were likewise marked by jurisdictional conflicts. The pope gave unconditional support to the Catholic party in France 99, to the Duke of Alba's repressive policy in the Low Countries, and to Mary Stuart, queen of Scots, in her claims to the British throne, from which in February 1570 he declared Elizabeth I deposed 100.

The following year Michele Surian would portray him as an irascible and impetuous man, but one "of exemplary life and irreproachable morals, with so rigorous a zeal for religion that he would wish its equal in everyone," proud of his moral austerity and of having ascended to the papacy without "ever seeking favor by detours or crooked paths, but always by the straight road" 101:

> It can be seen that in the papacy His Holiness has never devoted himself to delights or pleasures as his predecessors did; that he has changed neither his life nor his habits; and that he has not abandoned the exercise of the Inquisition that he practiced as a private man. […] His intellect is not especially acute, and his nature is difficult and suspicious. […] He has no experience in affairs of state, never having dealt with them until recently. […] Arguments governed by human prudence are not enough to persuade him, and if anyone thinks to overcome him by authority or intimidation, he immediately breaks out and throws everything into disorder, saying that he does not fear martyrdom, and that just as God placed him in this position, so too can God preserve him against every authority and power.

If Pius V had no experience in affairs of state - so little that he was convinced he could use "the sacred Scriptures" as cannon and ammunition with which to defend "the dignity of the apostolic see," as was already being reported to the imperial court in 1566 102 - he had ample experience in ecclesiastical affairs. Convinced that "the beginning and origin of heresies had for the most part been the bad example given by churchmen" 103, from the outset he wished to present himself as a model for the bishops in reforming the city's clergy, ordering them always to wear clerical dress and to promote schools of Christian doctrine 104. In March 1567 he had confessors examined, and in May of the following year he personally initiated the pastoral visitation of the diocese, beginning with Saint Peter's Basilica. As early as July 1566 it was reported that the pope "continually attends to reforming the affairs of Rome, which greatly displeases many," and that

“he wants to make Rome holy.” He was prepared to expel all its inhabitants provided not one remained who believed he could do “whatever his conscience dictates,” and ready to issue measures ensuring that heretics could never again say “that in Rome everything is done for money, because neither the Datary nor the Chancery nor the Penitentiary does anything” 105. Despite the unpopularity of his measures and their consequences for papal finances, Pius V attempted to cut through the simoniacal tangle created by the sale of curial offices and the administration of benefices, convinced that it was better to die of hunger than to lose one’s soul 106. In his report of 1569 Tiepolo wrote that the pope had reformed “in many respects the life of priests and of the court, so that today affairs in Rome are conducted differently than they used to be, and men, if they are not better, at least appear so” 107.

The measures issued during his pontificate also affected the laity, with rigid rules directed not only against those who dared blaspheme, play cards on feast days, or disrupt sacred rites, but also against sodomites (once again placed under inquisitorial jurisdiction), concubines and adulterers, whom the pope went so far as to threaten with death, as well as Roma, beggars, prostitutes and accommodating lodging-house keepers, necromancers, and sorceresses. Carnival celebrations were subjected to restrictions; triumphal floats and bullfights were forbidden; and certain religious observances that had degenerated into occasions for disorderly popular festivities were abolished 108. Justice was administered with inflexible severity against those guilty of ordinary crimes and against the bandits infesting the Roman countryside 109. The pope treated the Jews with particular harshness. In April 1566 he revived and intensified the oppressive measures issued by Paul IV and later abolished by Pius IV, and finally decreed their expulsion from the Papal States - with the exception of Rome and Ancona - in a bull of 26 February 1569 that accused them of every atrocity 110. In his treatment of the Jews as well, the unbending inquisitor who occupied the papal throne revealed his conception of the defense of the faith in primarily repressive terms, his sense of being invested with a divine mission to crush anyone who did not recognize the Church, and his way of experiencing religion as devotional fervor, severe moral discipline, charitable commitment in view of the afterlife, and above all obedience to theological norms and ecclesiastical authority. His early reputation for holiness, later sanctioned by his beatification in 1672 and canonization in 1712, attests to the long endurance of this model of Christian faith. In the suffocating gloom of its anthropological pessimism and authoritarian rigor, it was not without analogies to the model then being embodied by Carlo Borromeo 111, the other exemplary saint of the Counter-Reformation.

Within the Sacred College, the most important offices were entrusted above all to the so-called “Theatines,” men such as Bernardino Scotti, Giovanni Reumano, and Scipione Rebiba (“Morone’s bitterest enemy”) 112, all created cardinals by Paul IV 113. Besides Santoro and the secretary Rusticucci, those raised to the purple included figures such as the Franciscan Felice Peretti da Montalto, the future Sixtus V; the Dominican Arcangelo Bianchi, like Peretti a former inquisitor; the Cistercian abbot Jérôme Souchier; the Theatine Paolo Burali; the Dominican master general Vincenzo Giustiniani; and the already mentioned Antonio Carafa. In February 1568, amid rumors of imminent cardinalatial appointments, it was said that they would be “for the most part friars and theologians who are to be given responsibility for the Inquisition” 114. A long era was beginning in which the ecclesiastical careers most likely to prosper passed through offices in the Holy Office. In episcopal appointments too, special consideration was given to inquisitors, as shown by the choice of Tommaso Scotti as bishop of Terni in March 1566, Gregorio Boldrini as bishop of Mantua in February 1567, Camillo Campeggi as bishop of Sutri and Nepi in 1568, and Eustachio Locatelli as bishop of Reggio Emilia in April 1569 115.

Shortly after his election the Este ambassador Alfonso Rossetti warned that “in matters concerning the religion of friars and priests one must not cross him, and every possible respect must be shown him” 116. As early as 23 February 1566, less than two months after the election, someone observed that the Vatican looked more and more each day like a friars’ convent; and in June an imperial agent informed the court of Vienna that “in the palace one sees nothing but friars and Theatines who think they can reform the world in a day” 117. A month later Giovanni Antonio von Taxis wrote that the pope would have liked “all Rome to be a monastery of Saint Dominic” 118. No fewer than thirty-five of the bishops he appointed were Dominicans

119. In 1569 he designated his confrere Vincenzo Giustiniani, newly created cardinal, to serve alongside Morone as protector of the order 120. Before his death, finally, he ordered that he be buried in the Dominican habit which, as was written from Rome at the end of 1567, he had worn throughout his life and which had by then “truly become second nature” to him 121. The hour of the friars had returned. Pius V lavished privileges and concessions upon them, intending to remove their activity and preaching from the control of diocesan ordinaries, without fearing to contradict the decrees of the council, which in his opinion had in many matters behaved like a capricious “sprite” 122. This, among other things, would authorize him in many cases to respect neither their letter nor their spirit, interpreting them in normative rather than pastoral terms 123.

The bull *In coena Domini* of 1568, for example, effectively abolished the Tridentine canon that granted bishops the power to absolve in cases of heresy, restoring to the Inquisition all the prerogatives taken from it by Pius IV and emphatically reaffirmed by Pius V in 1566 with the bull *Inter multiplices curas* 124. The Holy Office was therefore called upon to reexamine the overly lenient sentences issued in the past, with an implicit and obvious reference to those imposed only a few years earlier by Pius IV and the Tridentine assembly. In this way both the council and the papal *plenitudo potestatis* itself were made subject to the tribunal of the faith. “Matters of the Inquisition […] are so strict here, and, to speak more accurately, so troublesome, that they must be handled with incredible dexterity, nor can Our Lord patiently hear any cardinal recommend an accused person,” Girolamo da Correggio wrote on 10 December 1567 125.

4. “To Nothing Does His Holiness Attend More than to the Inquisition”

With those inquisitorial friars restored to power, the hour of reckoning also struck for men such as Pietro Carnesecchi. After obtaining absolution from Pius IV, he was arrested in Florence in June 1566, no longer protected by Cosimo de’ Medici, who was quick to sense the change in the wind and understand the new role of Catholic Spain and the Holy See in an Italy now removed from imperial hegemony. Two months earlier Giulia Gonzaga had died in Naples, and the inquisitors had rushed to seize her papers, among which they found whole bundles of letters from the Florentine protonotary disguised by transparent ciphers 126. Immediately handed over to Rome, Carnesecchi was subjected to a new trial, which ended with his decapitation and burning at Ponte Sant’Angelo on 1 October 1567 as an impenitent heretic. For the occasion Pius V summoned the consistory, and the cardinals had to file past the charred, headless corpse, “hung naked by the feet” 127. The duke of Florence who twenty years earlier had commissioned frescoes in the choir of the basilica of San Lorenzo reflecting the core of Valdésian doctrine 128 could now be described by the Spanish ambassador to the Holy See as a “great executor of what is ordered by the Inquisition in Rome” 129, as demonstrated precisely by his prompt surrender to the Holy Office of the Florentine patrician whom he had protected for more than twenty years. He would be rewarded in 1569 with the title of grand duke of Tuscany, granted him by Pius V on the basis of the pope’s supposed right “to give and take away dignities and titles” 130, to the predictable indignation of the Habsburg courts, which Morone himself tried to appease in order to avert a formal protest 131. In the solemn ceremony held in the Sala Regia at the Vatican on 5 March 1570, the pontiff would place on Cosimo’s head the golden crown decorated with the ancient republican lily and bearing within it an inscription celebrating his merits for zealous commitment in defense of the Catholic faith 132. The fact that Paul III had once wished to have him tried by the Inquisition, and that only three years earlier he had burst out laughing on hearing of Ghislieri’s unexpected election 133, makes entirely clear the historic turning point marked by that pontificate.

The sensational public execution of that former secretary of Clement VII and “creature” of the Medici household encapsulated both his own tragedy and that of an entire generation of prelates, men of letters, and aristocrats who, like him, had deluded themselves into finding in Valdés’s compelling formulas the spiritual key with which to reconstruct a religious identity torn by different and contradictory demands and to try to heal the great doctrinal fractures that had run through their lives and divided their Church. Those rifts and fractures had reached the very summit of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as that mutilated body reminded the cardinals making their way to the consistory. All the more so because on that very occasion Pius V - as the final seal upon that history - proclaimed the rehabilitation of Paul IV’s nephews, condemned to death by his

predecessor in the same period in which he had absolved the Florentine heretic 134. No one missed the symbolic force of this coincidence of events, immediately grasped by the Venetian ambassador, who in his dispatch of 10 October stressed that “on one and the same morning Carnesecchi, who had been absolved by Pope Pius IV, was put to death, while Cardinal Carafa and the Duke of Paliano, who had been put to death by the same Pope Pius, were restored, if not to life, at least to good fame” 135.

Cosimo de’ Medici’s sudden reversal took many by surprise, among them Morone himself, whose name the Roman inquisitors encountered at every turn while reading Carnesecchi’s letters to Gonzaga. It was then, evidently fearing the worst, that he had numerous unspecified “papers” sealed in a large chest “nailed shut and bound with wire,” which the faithful Filippo Gheri sent to Florence, to Lelio Torelli, the powerful ducal secretary once close to the doctrines of the *spirituali*. Torelli was charged with delivering it to Beccadelli (then provost at Prato) or to the Florentine protonotary, who was still believed to be safe from any inquisitorial threat. Fortunately for him, Torelli held on to that embarrassing burden for some time because, as he wrote to Beccadelli on 20 August 1566, “shortly afterward came the affair of Carnesecchi and his papers” 136. Only later, and with many precautions, was the chest delivered to its destination, not without Torelli’s efforts to evade customs inspection. What it contained cannot be known, but the episode certainly reveals Morone’s anxiety as, in the aftermath of Pius V’s election, he watched the papers of Gonzaga and Carnesecchi seized one after another.

The Florentine protonotary’s was only one of the grim *autos-da-fé* repeatedly staged at the Minerva in these years, to which that “most rigorous” pontiff wished to give great prominence as a “solemn spectacle” before the entire papal court, granting generous indulgences to those who attended 137. “As though it were winter, | Pius burns Christians like wood, | to accustom himself to the heat of hell,” Pasquino’s biting verses commented 138. Even earlier they had evoked his proverbial reputation as a grim inquisitor, depicting him as an “assassin | who, to make himself divine, | turned Ripetta into a hell of living men,” and at the conclave as an austere “Theatine,” an “enemy of humankind,” who promised nothing good for courtly men of letters, fearful of “that wretched Dominican, Ghislieri, | a peasant from Bosco born in a pigsty, | coward, rascal a thousand thousand times,” of that “inhuman friar, | false enemy of Lutheran blood” 139. In January 1566, indeed, announcing to Genoa the election of that “excellent shepherd,” Cardinal Cicala had specified that “above all he will be a most bitter persecutor of heretics” 140. In July it was reported from Rome that “to nothing does His Holiness attend more than to the Inquisition,” and two years later that the pope was most severe in administering justice against heretics, exempting penitents from no punishment, often inflicting on them a kind of civil death, and invariably condemning relapsed offenders to the stake 141.

Besides issuing a series of decrees to define its duties and procedures and enlarge its jurisdiction, the pontiff resumed presiding over the sessions of the Holy Office and personally following its work (“he sees every trial and reads all the papers,” Cardinal Correggio wrote on 10 December 1567) 142. He wished to provide it with adequate financial resources to guarantee its future independence as well 143. At the congregation’s first meeting, on 2 February, he “gave many orders to remedy many abuses in matters of faith that require reform” 144. Then, as in later sessions (sometimes convened two or three times a week), “the decision is always made according to the pope’s vote, even when it is contrary to the opinion of the cardinals; and the pope’s vote is always the most severe of all,” Don Luis de Requesens wrote on 17 May 1567 145. A few months later the imperial ambassador did not conceal his conviction that Pius V, soon to engineer the triumph at Lepanto, was more inclined to hunt heretics than to fight the Turks 146. In March 1569 Tiepolo wrote to Venice that “as for the Inquisition, it has never seemed to him that enough is done or that the severity he desires is exercised,” observing that “where he hears no report or commotion, he believes that the person charged with the matter has failed and does not wish to investigate, and he forms a bad opinion of him.” In 1571 his successor reiterated that the pontiff thought “more about the Inquisition than about anything else” 147. In March of that very year Pius V placed alongside the Holy Office a new Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, composed entirely of cardinals drawn from the religious orders and charged with revising the Tridentine Index and publishing a new list of condemned works according to “the original rigor of Paul IV,” as was already being written in 1566 148. In this field too, the

bishops' autonomy in granting reading licenses, sanctioned by the council, was soon contradicted in the concrete governing practice of the Roman curia and the supreme tribunal of the faith 149.

One of Pius V's first initiatives, as early as the spring of 1566, was to construct a new palace to house the tribunal of the faith, together with its prisons and archive. Its first stone was laid on 2 September, with the workers employed on Saint Peter's Basilica diverted to the project and the Vatican construction site abandoned. "It will be like a fortress," it was written from Rome on 26 October 1566 150. The building was inaugurated three years later, when an inscription was placed over the entrance declaring the need that *haereticae pravitatis sectatores cautius coercerentur*. It still vibrated with indignation over what had happened at Pope Carafa's death, when the prison at Ripetta was attacked. That this historical memory remained alive and painful is also attested by the bull *Si de protegendis*, issued in the same year, which declared guilty of *lèse-majesté* - and therefore punishable by death - anyone who killed, wounded, exiled, or threatened an official of the Inquisition. The multiplication of trials and the growing demands of an activity that became feverish within a few months led Pius V to complain that he could rely on only "three or four at most who are trained in the Inquisition, whom we cannot spare; nor do we see that others understand the affairs of the Inquisition as well as we do. We do not know whether saying so is arrogance, but we have consumed our life and intellect in this practice!" 151.

Under the government of that "stubborn and […] rigid" pope 152, the years of benevolent absolutions, hurriedly closed proceedings, and "excessive leniency" were over. The inquisitorial machine could return to work, at last resuming its role at the center of papal policy, conditioning its choices and defining its priorities. This was what Cardinal Girolamo da Correggio hoped in July 1567. At the end of the year, while heresy trials in Mantua reached into the Gonzaga court itself, he lamented that for too long the Inquisition had been little more than a "joke" because of the inattention of popes "little inclined to this business" and insensitive to the danger at hand, with the consequence that it had then been made "odious to those who delight too much in license of life." Hence his conclusion that "the great indulgence, not to say negligence, of some former pontiffs stood in extreme need of the diligence and rigor of the present one" 153.

As the hopes for a new Christianity unleashed by the transalpine Reformation were being exhausted within the framework of new confessional orthodoxies, and the Pauline message of Christian liberty ran aground on the shoals of theological controversy and ecclesiastical authoritarianism, the spread of civil war in France and the fear that religious dissent might assume political significance led secular authorities as well to tighten the meshes of repression and collaborate with Rome. "Open your ears, O baptized princes," Girolamo Muzio had thundered in 1561 at the beginning of his *Catholica disciplina di principi*, in which, while predicting the imminent end of time, he listed numerous examples of divine punishment visited upon earthly rulers who strayed from the true faith 154. Everyone had to understand that heresy was not "a wound for soothing remedies […], because they do not heal it but make it ulcerate," Cardinal Correggio explained in December 1567, urging others to learn from events elsewhere: "Abjurations and punishments are what spare princes the need to raise armies, because whoever does not remedy things at the outset must end where the king of France has ended," whereas Spain's peace was founded on the crown's constant support for the Holy Office 155. For this reason Pius V urged Guglielmo Gonzaga to be more diligent "in the service of the Holy Inquisition," because after rebelling against God and the Church the heretics "will also rebel against Your Excellency." This appeal and threatening warning would not go unheard. Some time later the inquisitor of the Lombard city, Camillo Campeggi, would bluntly inform the duke of Mantua that "the more readily Your Excellency shows himself willing to favor the Office, the more agreeable His Holiness will be toward you" 156. The Inquisition thus established itself as an effective instrument of Roman centralization even in the provinces, among the Italian states and petty states to which the civil wars in France, the revolt of the Low Countries, the overwhelming power of the Catholic monarchy throughout the peninsula, and the spread of the new Tridentine climate suggested abandoning any ambition to resist its demands. Before long Giovanni Botero would undertake to explain to princes that reason of state coincided with reason of Church.

By vigorously asserting the principle that "in the age in which we now live princes must not tolerate any jesting about religion, whether in earnest or in play," and that "in the case of heretics […] rigor is the true

medicine for this plague" 157, the pontiff succeeded in imposing the supremacy of the inquisitorial tribunal throughout the peninsula. He insistently demanded and ultimately obtained the extradition to Rome of Bartolomé Carranza from Spain 158, Silvio Lanzoni and Antonio Cerruti from Mantua, Pietro Carnesecchi from Florence, Aonio Paleario from Milan, Guido Giannetti from Venice, and Bartolomeo Bartoccio from Genoa 159. The turning point was immediately perceived in Switzerland as well, where on 2 March 1568, in words whose meaning extended beyond the Mantuan situation to which they referred, Tobias Egli wrote bitterly from Chur to Heinrich Bullinger that in Italy "not a day passes without some being burned, strangled, or beheaded" 160. "In Italy the Antichrist rages, more furiously than ever before," the *antistes* of Zurich in turn reported to Théodore de Bèze on 5 April 161.

Through a series of briefs sent in 1567-68 to many Italian cities, promising light penalties to those who voluntarily came forward to confess their past errors and denounce their fellow believers, but without hesitating to use an iron fist to crush all opposition, Pius V at last succeeded in dealing a mortal blow to what remained of Italian religious dissent, whose final survivals would die out in the following years 162. Trials, convictions, and abjurations ceaselessly marked the activity of the Holy Office, whose very successes would gradually eliminate the need for the struggle against heresy for which it had been established. Far from leading to its extinction, this would merely prompt the inquisitors in the following decades to appropriate new tasks: repressing magical and witchcraft practices; supervising the beliefs, morals, behavior, reading, and devotional models of the faithful; and aggressively invading the fields of philosophy, science, literature, genuine or feigned sanctity, and the *solicitatio ad turpia* of confessors 163.

It is therefore unsurprising that Morone found himself in serious difficulty under a pontiff known to everyone not only as "very scrupulous in matters of faith" but also as his "mortal enemy" 164 - the man who had interrogated him in Castel Sant'Angelo and had been forced to endure his absolution as a betrayal of truth. He had therefore never concealed his profound aversion to Morone (which was cordially reciprocated), arising less from personal reasons than from absolute certainty about the heresies the cardinal had allegedly embraced in the past. Certainly Morone's immense prestige, unrivaled political experience, and rank as dean of the College of Cardinals 165 necessarily guaranteed him a leading place among its members and imposed him even upon the pontiff as an authoritative adviser "in affairs of state" 166. The sources indeed document his constant involvement in the current business of the curia. But the Milanese cardinal was the first to recognize that the sword of Damocles represented by his trial, though formally closed for years, was once more hanging over his head. At the end of the conclave, kneeling at Pius V's feet to render obedience, he is said to have whispered in his ear, "*Pater, demitte nobis debita nostra*," receiving an evasive reply "*in generalibus*." A Roman newsletter somewhat naively interpreted this as a sign that the newly elected pontiff "has forgiven Morone and received him into favor […] and blessed him" 167. Assuming those words were really spoken, few can have believed it, least of all the Milanese cardinal himself.

It is significant that Pius V's first biographer, Girolamo Catena, took care to report an alleged conspiracy organized in May 1566 by Sforza Morone, who was said to have written to two of the pope's fellow townsmen a letter - later revealed as a clever forgery - hiring them "to have the pope killed and Cardinal Farnese too, as one who might obstruct the papacy of his brother Cardinal Morone." The two fools had been induced to contrive the deception by the hope of great rewards, which instead turned into the death sentence carried out at Piacenza on 15 June after their slander was uncovered. But even earlier, as soon as he had been warned from Milan, Morone had presented himself before the pope "with the letter, telling him that God wished to visit him once more to confirm him in his patience," and offering "to place himself in the Castle or wherever His Holiness ordered. But the pontiff, who already understood the matter clearly, put his arms around him and comforted him with many affectionate words." This did not prevent "the rumor that Cardinal Morone had been imprisoned" from reaching Milan 168. Of course, one could not portray the president of the Council of Trent as a common assassin, and so Catena, after maliciously naming him, cleared him of all responsibility, emphasizing that the pope had placed no faith in those improbable accusations 169. They were merely stupid lies dictated by greed, yet sufficient to insinuate doubt while simultaneously exonerating Pius V from any suspicion of ill will toward the Milanese prelate.

In any case it cannot have been easy for Morone to submit to gestures of humiliating servility, as when the pope's nephew Fra Michele Bonelli was admitted to the Sacred College on 6 March 1566. Morone was among the first to press for the promotion, going so far as to throw himself "at [His Holiness's] feet, earnestly begging him to give the friar the red biretta and habit." But much more was needed to appease the pontiff, who was ready to see in such conduct only self-interested "flattery" 170. It is no coincidence that as early as March 1566, and again in January 1567, Morone asked permission "to go to his Church," at Modena. Pius V refused, "showing that he wishes to make use of him; and there is no doubt that the pope needs him, because he is a cardinal of great ability," a Mantuan agent commented 171, evidently missing the desire not to let him leave Rome. This could also be interpreted as the looming threat of a new arrest, of which other signs were not lacking.

5. Once Again in the Eye of the Storm

The first and immediately explicit of those signs was the already mentioned bull *Inter multiplices curas* of 21 December 1566, in which Pius V issued a series of provisions repudiating everything Pius IV had done in inquisitorial matters 172. On the basis of his long experience, the pope declared himself aware that some defendants, by means of mendacious testimony and forged documents, had succeeded in obtaining acquittals not only from local inquisitors but also "*sub plumbo vel annulo piscatoris expeditas*," and (as in Morone's case) had them approved in consistory by pontiffs who imposed perpetual silence on the Holy Office and prohibited further investigation. Thus came fictitious repentances and returns to the bosom of the Catholic Church, enabling the accused to continue spreading their poison. Those imprudent acquittals were now annulled, and the supreme tribunal of the faith was restored to the power to reopen proceedings even when they concerned "bishops, archbishops, patriarchs, primates, […] cardinals, legates even *de latere*, counts, barons, marquises, dukes, kings, and emperors," especially when new evidence emerged or doubts arose that the acquittals had been obtained fraudulently.

In effect, with this measure Pius V cast a heavy shadow of illegitimacy - and in any event provided the legal instrument for annulment - over the acquittals of Grimani, Di Capua, Sanfelice, Foscarari, Carnesecchi, and above all Morone. The latter was further implicated by the reaffirmed validity of the bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio*, with which Paul IV on 15 February 1559 had declared ineligible for the tiara any cardinal who had incurred even mere suspicion of heresy 173. As for the Florentine protonotary, with an implicit reference to this bull and the reasons that had prompted it, during an audience granted to the Medici ambassador on 16 May 1567 the pontiff stated bluntly that "in the time of his predecessor Pius he had told a mountain of lies, for which he had been absolved" 174. One need only glance through the so-called *Compendium* of the proceedings against Morone 175, probably drawn up by Santoro in 1566-67 in preparation for Carnesecchi's interrogations, to see how attentively that file was again read and used by the leaders of the Holy Office, whom the destruction of the archive had deprived of the evidentiary arsenal needed for the large-scale renewal of the struggle against heresy. For this reason too they planned to compile a "universal catalogue" of heterodox persons, collecting from all local tribunals "authenticated copies of sentences and abjurations and the names and surnames of accomplices and persons implicated," as Cardinal Rebiba wrote to the inquisitor of Mantua on 9 October 1568 176.

Carnesecchi was repeatedly questioned about Morone, in the certainty that the old bond of friendship between them would reveal *aliquam mutuam convenientiam circa doctrinam de fide* 177. His lengthy interrogations, extending over more than thirteen months, gave the inquisitors an opportunity to revisit the previous twenty-five years in search of new evidence against the Milanese cardinal. Morone's specter hovers over those trial papers like a hidden protagonist, continually evoked by the letters to Gonzaga, in which every slightest reference gave the inquisitors an opening to press Carnesecchi and catch him in contradiction 178. The Florentine protonotary labored to reject their insinuations, maintaining that he had never discussed "any dogma with His Most Illustrious Lordship, but only matters of God in general, *verbi gratia*, his providence," and reducing Morone's sympathetic interest in his inquisitorial troubles to friendly affection or concern about

the revenues of the abbey of Eboli. This only led his judges to read with suspicion even the letters in which he dwelt on disputes over the payment of those revenues 179.

Until the tragic conclusion of the trial, every slightest foothold offered by that correspondence was used to urge the defendant to confess everything he knew (and supposedly could not fail to know) about Morone, in the hope of extracting definitive proof of the cardinal's heresies. Conversely, the supreme Roman tribunal's certainty about those heresies was turned against Carnesecchi: his willingness to issue an explicit accusation against an accomplice ultimately became proof of his repentance and thus the only escape route the Holy Office intended to leave him. Hence the insistent questions requiring him to explain why he had hoped for the Milanese cardinal's election as pope. In the judges' eyes, this could only have arisen from a conviction that Morone held religious opinions similar to his own - that is, that he adhered to heterodox doctrines such as justification by faith alone and the like - and would therefore have abolished Catholic rites that heretics regarded as superstitious. Pressed hard, Carnesecchi finally had to admit that he had harbored "*saltem* some slight suspicion that His Most Illustrious Lordship was not wholly averse or alien to the article of justification" 180. It was the least he could say, and too little for the inquisitors.

The very insistence of such questions made him realize that the trial was being prolonged because he was suspected of having remained silent not only about many of his own offenses but also, and perhaps above all, about his presumed accomplices 181. Hence his attempt to escape what, in more or less good faith, he aptly called "their false imagination that I knew what I did not know, or that I kept silent or dissembled what I could and should have said" about certain prelates whom he soon perceived as "more deeply involved than the others." He was referring also to Pole, Seripando, and Di Capua, whose names appear in the records alongside Morone's and those of their former common friends. "What I have not said concerning others makes greater war on me," he wrote clandestinely from prison to Vincenzo Parpaglia, "because I could not and perhaps should not say it, even if I had been able, than what I have said concerning myself or what has come to the notice of this Holy Office by another route." He addressed Bartolomeo Concini, a close collaborator of Duke Cosimo, in similar terms, stressing that the "severity" used against him arose from the conviction not so much that he had lied or concealed matters about himself as that he had done so concerning "some friends and lords of mine, both living and dead" 182. It was precisely those pressing questions about his "friends and lords," put "with great diligence and insistence," that early planted in him the doubt, and then the certainty, that this had been the principal reason for his capture 183.

Despite the obligations of secrecy, Morone knew perfectly well that he was the absent presence at that crucial trial. As soon as news arrived of Carnesecchi's arrest, on 28 June Serristori wrote to Florence that in Rome "it was believed this was no good vigil for Cardinal Morone." On 5 July, the day after the protonotary arrived from Florence, Serristori's secretary Francesco Babbi reported that "very strange faces have been seen here, and I am told that Cardinal Morone has been left confused and half dead" 184. Ten days later he reported the arrest and transfer to Rome of Donato Rullo and Guido Giannetti, both connected to Di Capua, insisting that all this raking over "old matters […] of heresy" seemed aimed above all at frightening the Milanese cardinal, "who is in very low spirits, finds no rest day or night, and they say has entirely lost his sleep and is going down such a bad road that it is feared he may this autumn go to learn about the affairs of the next world" 185. On the nineteenth, reporting the widespread opinion that Carnesecchi would name "a great number" of accomplices, "and perhaps some cardinal too," Babbi returned to Morone, who was said to have told the pope that he was entirely ready to return to prison if His Holiness so wished, receiving the benevolent assurance that the pope harbored no suspicion against him. "But the world believes he feels otherwise," Babbi concluded, observing among other things that "rooms for nobles" were also being prepared in the new palace of the Holy Office then under construction 186.

Serristori had been still more explicit shortly before when reporting to Florence a conversation with Cardinal Pacheco about curial maneuvering in anticipation of a possible conclave. When Morone's name was mentioned, the Spanish cardinal replied "that there was no point considering him, because he was utterly ruined and there was no longer any doubt in the world" 187. All the more so because the arrests of Giannetti ("his coming here is of the greatest importance for matters of religion") 188 and Rullo ("they say he was the

soul of the cardinal of England") 189 suggested that Morone's situation was destined to worsen. On the thirtieth of that same month Zaccaria Dolfin wrote in cipher to Florence that "as for Cardinal Morone, even if nothing is found against him sufficient to make him abjure, at least enough will be found to begin a new trial," so that "there can be no further talk of making him pope" 190. In the new atmosphere created in Rome under a pontiff devoted "with his whole soul to this Holy Inquisition" 191, Morone had to strain his ears throughout the trial of Carnesecchi for every fragment of news, every indiscretion, every whisper escaping the walls of the Holy Office, knowing full well that his fate depended in large measure on what the protonotary said about him.

Only more than a year later, on 21 September 1567, would the *auto-da-fé* be held at the Minerva in which that refined Florentine patrician, dressed in the humiliating penitential garment, heard his death sentence in the presence of all the cardinals then in Rome, as the pope had requested - many of whom he had known in the past, as the Venetian ambassador wrote a week later. In a long dispatch he reported that only Ugo Buoncompagni, the future Gregory XIII, had been absent from the grim ceremony, "because he would not go out of regard for a nephew of his who had to abjure," together with one other cardinal - unnamed but all too easily identifiable - who had asked "permission from the pope to leave the city so as not to be present, fearing that everyone might look at him because of the close friendship and association he had had with Carnesecchi" 192. Morone's failure to appear "caused Gambara and all his clique to utter fifty little comments," and was immediately noted by the Mantuan resident as well. On 1 October - the day of Carnesecchi's execution at Ponte Sant'Angelo and of the consistory in which the rehabilitation of the Carafa was proclaimed - he again recorded the absence of the Milanese cardinal, who had "gone out of town to change the air" 193. Nor did the matter escape Babbi, who two days later informed Duke Cosimo that Morone "was not present at this sentence, nor at the abjuration held fifteen days ago, having always been Carnesecchi's friend; and he is still away, not without everyone's wonder, especially in this very rainy weather" 194.

Of particular interest, finally, is the account sent on 23 September to Cardinal Marcantonio Bobba by Vincenzo Parpaglia, an old associate of Carnesecchi. He informed him of the sentence against the protonotary as an impenitent heretic, reporting with pious indignation that the summary of the trial read at the Minerva had revealed "countless articles of heresy from the doctrine of Luther and Valdés of Naples." These were most grave heresies of which Carnesecchi had finally been "convicted by letters he had written to various important persons and various heretics in Geneva and elsewhere, also revealing the intimate friendship he had had with Flaminio, Priuli, Soranzo, and other suspects." These names, once illustrious and now proscribed, belonged to men whom the Piedmontese abbot himself had frequented in the early 1540s in the Viterbo palace of the cardinal of England. Hence his anxiety to distance himself from that world, lending credit to every piece of gossip and heaping every kind of infamy upon Carnesecchi in order to proclaim his unreserved adherence to the new inquisitorial wind blowing through the Rome of Pius V 195. Francesco Babbi's tone was no different, though motivated by other concerns. He grew ever more indignant against that "perfidious heretic" who for more than twenty-five years had managed to deceive both the duke of Florence and the pope of Rome. On 29 September he reported that the curia was buzzing with rumors of Morone's imminent arrest, because - in addition to Carnesecchi's - the pope had revoked all the absolutions issued by Pius IV "as one badly informed about the conduct of those who were absolved," including the Milanese cardinal, who remained holed up "in the greatest suspicion and jealousy" in his suburbicarian diocese of Porto. "Although he is the great cardinal everyone knows, and so Catholic, wagers are nevertheless being made here that within a few weeks he will be in prison" 196.

A few days later, as the echoes of that sensational execution began to fade, Serristori and Babbi at last began to understand that in the tribunal's very determination to make Carnesecchi confess everything he was presumed to know there was something different and more important than his stubbornness, his "madness," and his "iniquitous and […] malicious" spirit. Babbi informed the Medici court of this on 10 October, no doubt after hearing - perhaps from Pacheco or Gambara in person - what was then feeding curial gossip 197:

He [Carnesecchi] was kept alive for those ten days after the sentence because these lords of the Inquisition were around him, and above all Cardinal Gambara, to make him name Cardinal Morone and the archbishop of Otranto, of whom the same Gambara is a mortal enemy. And it is thought that if Carnesecchi had named them as offenders like himself, His Holiness might perhaps have granted him his life. But although he had always been a very close friend of theirs, it does not appear that he named them in that way. It can be seen that His Holiness, because of old resentments he bears against those two, would gladly have struck them a blow, but he has apparently not yet found the way. Meanwhile Cardinal Morone, despite these terrible times, remains outside Rome, and it is firmly believed that if he knew where to go, he would not return for the duration of this pope's life. The pope has never been willing to give him permission to go to his church of Modena, despite all the entreaties he has so often made.

6. New Trials and New Investigations

Pietro Carnesecchi was not the only person whom the inquisitors subjected to intense questioning in order to obtain new evidence against Morone. Another was Endimio Calandra, formerly secretary to Ercole Gonzaga and connected since the early 1540s with several circles of Italian religious dissent. He was tried at Mantua in the spring of 1568, and the tribunal expected his interrogations to "uncover great things," not least because the Florentine protonotary had mentioned his name 198; like Carnesecchi, he had lived in Venice in the 1550s. Only ten days after his arrest - which took place on 17 March 1568, when the local Holy Office had almost completed its inquiry into the city's heterodox movement - Cardinal Rebiba sent precise instructions about the questions to be put to Calandra concerning his relations with Carnesecchi, enclosing an extract from the latter's interrogations, although he had already been executed 199. The Roman tribunal acted in this way because it believed the Mantuan might make important revelations about "some great prelates and cardinals, dead and living," regarding whom every "diligence" had to be exercised and, "for the service of God, every consideration set aside." On the pope's orders, Rebiba therefore asked that Calandra be questioned as to whether he knew of high prelates, living or dead, who were or had been heretics or suspected of heresy, who they were, and where and when this had occurred, above all whether he had heard Carnesecchi speak of them. If such explicit allusions were not enough, the recollection of the trials of Bernardo Bartoli and Giovan Battista Scotti and of the suspicions against Pole, Priuli, Flaminio, and "others, both living and dead, of that school" was intended to indicate beyond all doubt the road to be followed. It is unsurprising that Morone's name was omitted - or rather barely concealed behind the constant reference to the "living" - but even the least attentive reader (and the inquisitor of Mantua, Fra Camillo Campeggi, was certainly not that) could instantly grasp the obvious reference to his trial under Paul IV: "It will be easy for the said Pero [Gelido] and Carnesecchi to have told Messer Endimio something about personages both dead and living, especially because during the time Endimio associated with them, which was in 1557, 1558, and 1559, occasion could easily arise to discuss and speak of some of them because of the events then taking place." Entirely predictable, therefore, was the recommendation to Campeggi to "keep this business secret, for it is of the importance you can judge for yourself" 200.

Calandra's abjuration - which some in those days believed imminent - was deferred at Pius V's wish. The pope followed the case personally, "because he thought him a man who should not be dispatched in fifteen or twenty days, and that something more might be gained through imprisonment," as Cardinal Pisa wrote to Campeggi on 7 April. "These old heretics who have associated with great men know many things, and experience here shows them to be animals not to be dispatched so quickly," as earlier experience with Apollonio Merenda and more recent experience with Carnesecchi and Giannetti had demonstrated 201. In accordance with the instructions from Rome, therefore, the proceeding at Mantua took a new turn beginning with the interrogation of 8 April 1568, when Messer Endimio was invited to report the names of everyone he had heard mentioned by Gelido and Carnesecchi. Without much prompting - almost as though he had read his judges' minds - the defendant immediately answered that "they told me Cardinal Pole and Cardinal Morone held their opinions," also naming Pietro Antonio Di Capua and Galeazzo Caracciolo, to whom the inquisitors at once added other names, beginning with Valdés. In response to a precise question, Calandra finally clarified that his interlocutors had never told him exactly which doctrines Pole, Morone, Flaminio,

and Priuli held, only that they were like their own. And when he had observed that justification *sola fide* and its consequences had been condemned by the council, “they replied that many learned and great men held them, and named the aforesaid cardinals and Priuli, and said that Flaminio too, who had been a man of ability while he lived, held them” 202.

With few exceptions (for example, Flaminio’s characterization of Ochino and Vermigli as “the apostles of Italy”) 203, Calandra’s answers as a whole offered no new evidence against the *spirituali*, and Morone in particular; nor could they have done so, since they consisted essentially of statements *ex auditu*. But his depositions fitted well into the mosaic that the Roman Holy Office had been assembling piece by piece for more than twenty years. Perhaps they added no unknown information, but they certainly confirmed the overall validity of the picture. This was probably precisely what Rebiba expected, for he asked that a copy of the proceedings gathered thus far be sent to him as quickly as possible so that he could personally verify what emerged. At Mantua they hastened to comply on 11 April 1568, two days after the latest interrogation, but addressed the packet to the pontiff himself, confirming the latter’s great interest in the case. Far from settling the matter, however, as could easily have been foreseen, the delivery of this material to Rome merely fueled the hope of obtaining still more. On 14 April, when sending Campeggi a copy of what Carnesecchi had said about Calandra, Rebiba again stressed the pope’s wish that the case be handled “with great dexterity, to draw out the rot of the many things he knows” 204. Endimio consequently had to face three further interrogations 205, whose records were immediately transcribed and sent to Rome, where the pontiff wanted to know their contents with the utmost urgency.

Moreover, the fact that in Pius V’s or Rebiba’s eyes Calandra was not merely a defendant to be judged but also a potential witness who might be useful in the future is suggested by the anxiety with which, on 1 May, Rebiba requested that a new authenticated copy of the proceedings - one usable to full effect *in caput alienum* - be sent to Rome, while urging Campeggi to forbid the prisoner to be “given anything to eat from outside.” The risk had to be averted that he might pass into the next world if someone thought of disposing of a dangerous witness 206. Despite his very poor health and the protection he could command, Calandra was left to rot in prison for months, until his abjuration on 12 September, after being “condemned to perpetual imprisonment, […] declared deprived of every office and benefice and of any pensions whatsoever, and sentenced as penance to provide two hundred thousand stones for the building of the Holy Office.” This was too long a time for rumors not to begin circulating about the reasons for such relentlessness, as attested by the embarrassing question Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga put to Campeggi, “whether it was true that Calandra was not being dispatched because of M.” 207.

It is therefore not arbitrary to connect the conclusion of Carnesecchi’s trial and the opening of Calandra’s with the summons to Rome, by a special brief in February 1568, of Pietro Antonio Di Capua. After participating in the final phase of Trent among the most intransigent curialists, in November 1565 Di Capua had been appointed nuncio to Venice, where he had associated with Carnesecchi and tried to see Giannetti, once his secretary. On learning of Pius IV’s death, Di Capua informed the Sacred College that he intended to resign “because he wished to go attend to the care of his church,” evidently foreseeing what awaited him 208. Shortly after the election, in March 1566, Pius V removed him from office and summoned him to Rome. Di Capua did not appear, however, taking refuge first on his Abruzzese estates and then at Otranto, where he sought to promote a reform modeled on the canons of the strictest Tridentine orthodoxy 209. The Florentine ambassador in Rome did not miss the link joining his case, past and present, to that of the Milanese cardinal, who was likewise “in low spirits,” because “the pope wishes their absolutions to be surreptitious and granted by favor rather than by justice,” as he wrote on 5 July 1566 210.

The health reasons invoked to postpone his appearance did not save Di Capua from a fresh summons to Rome in 1568, where he arrived at the end of March 211. Despite the pontiff’s benevolent reception, court corridors lost no opportunity to “mutter” that “bad fortune” was now bound to fall upon the Neapolitan prelate 212. The Venetian ambassador had no doubt that he had come “on account of the Inquisition” 213, and on 13 March he was able to report that Di Capua had had the pope informed of his hope not to lose “the reputation he had acquired at the council and in Venice,” and of his intention not to allow “those biased

against him, or rather his open enemies, to vent their rage." His Holiness's reply was not exactly reassuring: he had "summoned him because he was not entirely at ease about past matters, and it was well for his honor to bring them to an end; but he should come in good heart, because he would have no other judge and father than His Holiness himself, and should resolve to tell the truth and entrust himself wholly to his clemency" 214. Two weeks later, before even being received by the pope, the archbishop himself informed the Venetian ambassador that he had "understood that the pontiff's intention is to annul the absolution he received perhaps fifteen years ago from Pope Julius III and renew the examination of the matters charged against him at that time" 215.

It is unsurprising that Morone, then at Modena and engaged in suppressing the city's religious dissent 216, felt some anxiety and tried to keep himself informed about Di Capua's case, as shown by a Roman newsletter sent to him on 31 March 217. In May rumor had it that the archbishop of Otranto would have to abjure in secret 218, as he himself considered likely, "knowing the nature of the old humors, not at all digested since they first began," as he wrote to Cesare Gonzaga on 12 June 219. Only in November was he authorized to leave the city and "go home to put his affairs in order," but under an obligation to return as quickly as possible 220. By the end of January 1569 he was indeed back in Rome, from where he could tell Gonzaga that he was satisfied with his meeting with the pontiff, "although the words were general" 221. Received with the assignment of some ecclesiastical benefices and "with other signs of goodwill to gratify him with something greater, holding him in high esteem for his virtues and ability," Di Capua had to remain in Rome until the autumn 222, where he had the acts of the Otranto provincial synod of 1567 printed as proof of his pastoral zeal. During those months Pius V subjected that authoritative prelate to a trial - albeit a secret one - with the intention, among other things, of keeping him within reach should he finally decide to formalize with a new arrest the resumption of the investigation into Morone, and in any case of making him available to reveal what he knew about the heterodox past of many former friends and fellow believers. This is confirmed by a note added by an inquisitor in the margin of a *Summarium* of Morone's trial: "The archbishop of Otranto pronounced a canonical purgation under Julius III, but afterward, following the examination of new witnesses, was absolved benevolently and secretly under Pius V" 223.

Meanwhile, on 9 February 1568, a copy of the *confessio* Morone had drafted in the days following his arrest - specifically the copy bearing at its foot the autograph signatures of four distinguished theologians attesting the complete orthodoxy of the text 224 - was authenticated by Claudio de Valle, notary of the Holy Office, evidently with a view to its formal use 225. Less than a month later, in early March, Cardinal Rebiba wrote to Matteo Priuli, bishop of Vicenza and nephew and heir of Alvise, asking him to verify whether any documents formerly belonging to Pole were among his uncle's estate and, if so, to deliver them urgently to the papal nuncio in Venice, Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti, the future Innocent IX 226. During his interrogations, when pressed to say what he knew about the private papers left by the cardinal of England, Carnesecchi had replied that "in all likelihood" they must "be in the possession of Priuli's heirs, since he was Pole's heir, unless Morone has already received them, to whom it appears that Pope Pius IV ordered the said writings to be handed over as executor substituted by His Holiness for the testament of the aforesaid cardinal" 227. Matteo Priuli immediately presented Facchinetti with "certain writings" found among his uncle's papers, and the nuncio hastened to send Rebiba an inventory, as he informed the cardinal-nephew Michele Bonelli on 13 March. A week later, by return post, Bonelli communicated the pontiff's "express order that you send them here by the safest route you consider appropriate, enclosing a list of all of them and also leaving another inside the chest as a safeguard." Facchinetti obeyed by entrusting the "valise" containing those papers to a nephew traveling to Rome at the end of August. Among them was also the *Quinternus litterarum quondam illustrissimae dominae marchionisse Piscarie et aliarum*, an authenticated copy of which de Valle immediately inserted in the dossier against Morone 228.

Of considerable interest in this context is the highly confidential letter - "into your own hands" - sent on 1 June 1568 to Bartolomeo Concini by a Medici agent in Rome, Ludovico Ceresuola, to inform him of an obscure episode following the death in April of Cardinal Giovanni Michele Saraceno. In June 1559 Saraceno had been a member of the commission charged with reading the acts of Morone's trial in preparation for the

sentence, and as such had been required to take “an oath under excommunication and eternal damnation not to reveal anything outside” 229. On that occasion a copy of the acts had been entrusted to him. His heirs, “I do not know whether out of malice or stupidity, placed this heading among an inventory of their books and papers: the trial of Morone.” So wrote Ceresuola, who mistakenly believed that the original of those incendiary inquisitorial papers had been lost in the burning of Ripetta in 1559, and therefore attached great importance to the report. He then added several pieces of corridor gossip, apparently all favorable to Morone, which nevertheless attest the widespread perception that a threatening storm was again gathering over his head 230:

Gambara - the Medici agent continued - who keeps spies everywhere, learning of this trial, which was thought lost when Ripetta burned, and desiring nothing more than to pierce Morone through and bring him down, sent the procurator of the Holy Office in one of his coaches to ask the said heirs for this trial. […] The pope has no intention of reviving old matters against Morone, although when speaking of Morone with his enemies he shows that he esteems him more than he loves him. On the other hand, upon Morone’s return [from Modena] he showed him extraordinary caresses and honors, such as rising rather more than slightly, embracing him tightly, giving him a share in the affairs of France and Spain, giving him a long account of the promotion of cardinals, and almost rendering him the reason for many other things. We shall see what time brings forth.

Ceresuola’s optimism was misplaced. Very different messages emerged from the trials of Carnesecchi, Calandra, Di Capua, Rullo, and Giannetti; from the seizure of Giulia Gonzaga’s papers; from the arrest and transfer to Rome of her secretary Giovan Battista Pérez 231; from the final trials of Valdésians, including that of Mario Galeota held in Naples in 1566-67 232; and from the definitive repression of heterodox ferment in Mantua and Modena, the latter entrusted to Morone himself in 1567-68 233. This slow succession of events continued to make the Milanese cardinal feel the inquisitors’ breath on his neck. On 28 May 1569, reporting Giannetti’s sentence to “perpetual imprisonment,” Paolo Tiepolo wrote that capital punishment had been spared him “because they say that through him information has been obtained about many important matters” 234.

The arrest of Niccolò Franco in September 1568 and, twelve months later, that of Pallantieri - both former collaborators and trusted men of Morone, and both shortly afterward severely punished for their hostility to the Carafa - also agitated the Milanese cardinal, who was left entirely “confused and overturned” to see “these men of his arrested every day.” So wrote Babbi, who on 1 October 1569 informed Cosimo de’ Medici that “having once been accused of this stain, it may be believed that he does not sleep soundly, seeing a pope so diligent and rigorous in this business” 235. There is no doubt that Franco was called upon to pay the bill - and reconstruct the background - for the savage pasquinades against Paul IV, the “bloodthirsty wolf thirsting for human blood,” upon whom he had poured every bloodiest and most obscene insult in revenge for the prison in which the pope had confined him for eight months. These pasquinades naturally also spoke of the unjust wrongs and “calumnies” suffered by Morone 236. The latter had read them with great pleasure (but also some anxiety) during the years when Franco was in his service, from 1560 to 1568, only for the writer later to leave him with bitter resentment. Yet this does not explain why the Holy Office itself was charged with conducting that trial, which certainly was not “on a matter of faith,” as the editor of its records acknowledged 237. Once again, the tribunal was brought in because of the close relationship between the rehabilitation of the Carafa, on the one hand, and, on the other, the revocation of Pius IV’s absolutions and the resumption of the sensational heresy proceedings they had imprudently closed. Hence the papal decision to inflict a deserved punishment upon that ferocious enemy of Paul IV, until recently a member of Morone’s household, but also the conviction that he would be able to supply useful information to the inquisitors, who were especially interested to know *si noverit aliquos haereticos seu de haeresi suspectos* 238.

Franco himself, as had happened to Carnesecchi, realized that the inquisitors kept him under pressure in the hope that he would “denounce Morone.” Even before entering prison, in the aftermath of Pius V’s election and probably during the months when the Florentine protonotary was being interrogated, a trusted man of the cardinal had reported hearing that the inquisitors “have secretly tried Cardinal Morone and want to send him to the Castle” 239. For this reason they assigned as his cellmate the Mantuan priest Antonio

Cerruti, willing to earn merit in the judges' eyes by acting as provocateur and spy. On 1 August 1569 he reported hearing Franco say that "when Carnesecchi was imprisoned in Tor di Nona, Cardinal Morone had secretly sent someone to speak to him and ask whether he had named him in the Holy Office; and Carnesecchi sent word back that he had not, and that he should be cheerful and of good heart." A year later, during a confrontation with Cerruti, Franco had to admit that he had told him Cardinal Morone "had learned from Carnesecchi in Tor di Nona that in the Inquisition they had questioned him about Morone, of which the cardinal had complained in the pope's antechamber with other cardinals" 240.

On this occasion Cerruti did not fail to implicate Morone as partly responsible for the extremely harsh anti-Carafa invective written by his cellmate in the past, specifying that Franco had expressed all his anger at having failed to publish clandestinely "the work written against Paul IV, to which he wished to add a preface full of many things he had learned after finishing the work by talking with Cardinal Morone and with one called Pallantieri, things to amaze the world." Aware that the Mantuan priest had tried to make him declare "that the said cardinal had prompted me to write the work" 241, Franco had more than once to answer whether the project of printing that savage anthology had been encouraged by "great personages," and in particular by the Milanese cardinal, whose name had been mentioned by some prosecution witnesses in the certainty that "it would be a credible thing" 242. Significantly, the inquisitors' curiosity also focused on Pole and the papers he had left after his death 243, which they had good reason to believe were at least partly preserved in the home of the Milanese cardinal, the last representative of his "school" 244. On 11 March 1570 Niccolò Franco, "formerly a servant of Morone," as a Roman newsletter of that day specified, was hanged at Ponte Sant'Angelo 245.

Precisely during the months when the inquisitors were pressing Franco, moreover, documentation reached their hands concerning a lost denunciation made on 5 March 1560 - the day before Morone's absolution was read in consistory - by Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla, who died a few months later. The original text of the denunciation was lost, but a trace remained in an anonymous *Relación de lo que acerca del artículo de la justificación se ha dicho de algunos reverendíssimos cardenales*, presented on 7 April 1567, which aroused lively interest among the Roman inquisitors. This is shown by the fact that in March 1569, with all the confidentiality required by the circumstances, Rebiba sent to Spain a memorandum with detailed instructions to verify the origin and authenticity of the document, which had reached Rome among the papers of the case against Carranza, and to ascertain what it affirmed about Morone "on questions concerning the faith and the council, on which the cardinal had expressed disagreement" 246. It contained disturbing statements about Contarini, the intense friendship that had bound him to Pole and Morone, who regarded him as an oracle, the public reputation that the two cardinals shared his opinion, and above all about the cardinal of England. Pole was described as ready to offer complicity and protection to "persons very ill-famed in religion," closely associated with such figures as Ochino, Valdés, Colonna, Flaminio, and many others "noted as Lutherans," unwilling to subscribe to the Tridentine decree on justification, and suspected by the Holy Office as early as the conclave of 1549 and under Julius III, suspicions later confirmed by the revocation of his English legation and his summons to Rome by Paul IV 247.

As for Morone, Mendoza confirmed not only his intimate friendship with Pole (to the point of feeling himself one person with him) but also some of the accusations that had emerged from earlier trial testimony: namely, that in his diocese of Modena "he and his collaborators obstructed Catholic preachers and favored those who were not." Moreover, on the basis of a conversation with him around 1550-51, Mendoza could assert that even then the Milanese cardinal had not concealed his conviction that the conciliar decree on justification should be revoked, because in its present form it could not stand. "I tell you plainly: this decree on justification cannot stand," he was said to have declared in Mendoza's presence, words seemingly made to give the inquisitors confirmation of their increasingly well-documented certainties 248. The Spanish inquiry was quickly concluded at the end of May 1569, and copies of the documents collected were soon forwarded to Rome. Another significant piece was thus added to Morone's already voluminous case file.

Chapter Twenty-Two

“Today Is a Time Only for Rigor and Punishment”: Again under Investigation and Again Bishop of Modena

1. The Resumption of the Trial

It is likely that Franco’s very revelations - in which religious suspicions, political conflicts, and personal vendettas were intertwined in the tangled historical legacy of Paul IV - caused Pius V’s indignation to erupt. Never as at that moment did he contemplate imprisoning Morone once more in Castel Sant’Angelo. The report Tiepolo presented to the Venetian Senate in March 1569 stated that the pontiff devoted body and soul to the Inquisition, his “principal profession, […] with such diligence that it can be said he spends half his time on this matter alone.” Moreover, in always applying “the utmost rigor that can be imagined,” he did not content himself “with punishing new offenses, for he diligently investigates old ones of ten and twenty years ago” 1, an obvious reference to the Milanese cardinal. After Carnesecchi’s execution, indeed, Morone was the last and most coveted prey to have escaped the Holy Office. Pius V concealed his initiatives behind the mask of apparent cordiality, receiving him with a “most kindly face” and sometimes keeping him in discussion “for more than a full hour” 2.

At a certain point, however, the pope could no longer restrain the old anger simmering within him. During a conversation with Cardinal Madruzzo in January 1570, he began shouting “with agitation and indignation” that he did not consider Morone “a good man or one who lived as was fitting for cardinals, and that his household was the refuge of all the heretics secretly in Rome.” Immediately informed by Madruzzo, the Milanese cardinal “was left so thunderstruck and so bewildered that for some time he could not speak,” the Medici ambassador wrote to Florence on 31 January. He reported how shortly afterward Morone rushed to the pope’s feet to tell him “with great meekness” that on hearing “the words His Holiness had spoken against him, he had been left the most astonished and amazed man in the world.” In what was very probably nothing more than a conscious performance by both parties, he innocently professed his surprise, since precisely “when he thought himself wholly in His Holiness’s favor, he saw and heard the very opposite.” His efforts and explanations availed little: “When he tried to excuse himself, the pope repeated the same words he had spoken against him to the cardinal of Trent and, turning his back, left him there - to Morone’s displeasure as great as such a case warrants, coming from a pope as terrible and scrupulous as this one in such matters.” Hence Babbi’s renewed conviction, expressed in a dispatch of 3 February, that Morone’s arrest was now imminent 3.

Precise documentation makes it possible to demonstrate that in the winter of 1569-70 the project of once again confining Morone in Castel Sant’Angelo and reopening the trial against him came within a hair’s breadth of being carried out. The evidence consists of a file containing opinions by Bolognese jurists and theologians consulted by the Roman Holy Office about a packet of trial documents collected under Paul IV, from which extracts had been sent to Bologna 4. The choice of those professors and friars of proven orthodox rigor probably arose not only from the prestige of the university of Bologna, but above all from a wish to circulate those incendiary papers far from Rome and curial circles, thereby preserving in the greatest secrecy an initiative that might produce sensational consequences and avoiding leaks, corridor rumors, imprudent gossip, and premature recriminations. To this end the inquisitors also tried to proceed with every caution in dealing with their Bolognese consultants, concealing Morone’s name in the copy of his *confessio* and in extracts - it is difficult to say how selective - of the principal prosecution testimony gathered during the inquiry. The defendant was presented as “a certain abbot” (*abbas quidam*), so as to hide his membership of the Sacred College while also providing a plausible explanation for the pastoral and jurisdictional authority he had once exercised, as well as his participation in the Council of Trent both at the first and abortive convocation of 1542-43 and at the last in 1563. His political and religious experiences during the German nunciatures were disguised as imaginary missions he had carried out in France 5, a land of heretics very

much in the news in those years. These expedients were useful for covering the defendant's identity with an elusive mask - though surely more in the hopes of the Roman inquisitors than in the convictions of those shrewd consultants, some of whom had personally known Morone - and also for discrediting the pleas of theological incompetence he had once advanced in an effort to mitigate the errors charged against him.

Eleven opinions were drawn up in Bologna on the evidence of guilt emerging from the documents sent from Rome against that wretched abbot 6. All were undated except the ninth, signed by Fra Lucio Anguissola at San Francesco in Bologna on 25 January 1570 7, which makes it possible to establish the period in which the dossier was assembled and probably sent to Rome. The persons consulted were distinguished by their canonistic and theological competence and personal authority 8. In the order in which their opinions follow one another in the manuscript, the first was Francesco Giovannetti, a pupil of Alciati, who graduated *in utroque* at Bologna in 1540 and taught canon law there until 1547, when the duke of Bavaria called him to teach at Ingolstadt. He eventually returned home, resumed his chair, and held numerous offices, including that of consultant to the Holy Office. The author of a history of the popes, an unpublished biography of Pius V, and numerous legal treatises, he would live until 1586. Sebastiano Rolandi had already taken part in Morone's trial. As fiscal advocate of the Bolognese Inquisition and vicar general of Archbishop Giovanni Campeggi, he had directed the cardinal's defensive trial held at Bologna in early 1560. Ordained a priest after taking his degree in 1551, he taught at Bologna between 1556 and 1563 and died there in 1608, after serving for a time as podestà at Ferrara and then as councillor, vicar general, and judge to Vespasiano Gonzaga in the duchy of Sabbioneta. Antonio Gessi, a member of a senatorial family connected by kinship to the city's patriciate, graduated *in utroque* in 1544 and taught continuously at the University of Bologna (apart from a brief interruption in 1566) until his death in 1592, alternating courses on the *Infortiatum* and the *Digestum novum*. Giacomo Venenti, who graduated in 1530 and was likewise a consultant to the Bolognese Inquisition, began teaching in 1532 and continued until 1572. The following year also marked the end of the teaching career of his colleague Camillo Castellani, a cleric and doctor of both laws, who in 1570 began lecturing on the Decretals after teaching the *Institutiones* since 1567. Also a priest and archpriest of the cathedral was Annibale Grassi, who had taken his doctorate at sixteen in 1553 and taught at the University of Bologna until 1571, apart from a brief interruption in 1563-64 when he went to Rome as referendary *utriusque Signaturae* and lieutenant of Cardinal Camerlengo Guido Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora. In order to place him in the retinue of his nephew Michele Bonelli, sent as nuncio to Portugal, Pius V called him back to Rome in 1571. There he would resume teaching under Gregory XIII, who made him a cleric of the Camera, rector of the Sapienza, and consultant to the Holy Office, and finally in 1575 bishop of Faenza, a see he resigned ten years later in favor of his brother Giovanni Antonio. The author, among other works, of a *De iurisdictione universali summi pontificis in temporalibus*, he died in Madrid in 1590 after serving there for two years as apostolic nuncio.

Alongside the five law professors of the University of Bologna and the fiscal advocate of the city's Inquisition were four friars: the Servite Fra Cirillo Franchi of Bologna, professor of theology from 1566 until his death in 1585; Giulio Sirenio of Brescia, from the order of Saint Jerome at Santa Maria delle Grazie, formerly professor of metaphysics at Bologna in 1553-54 and later of theology from 1568 to 1575 and again from 1585 to 1593; the Conventual Franciscan Lucio Anguissola, a Piacentine nobleman then fifty years old and "unworthy rector and lecturer of the Franciscan Studium," arrested in 1548 on suspicion of heresy but cleared as early as 1550, when he was for a time entrusted with the chair of logic at the Bolognese Studium. After taking part in the final phase of Trent, he taught metaphysics from 1572 until his death twenty years later. The series of Bolognese consultants was completed by an otherwise unidentified Fra Girolamo da Fano, a Dominican *baccalaureus*, and finally Angelo Peruzzi of Senigallia, likewise *iuris utriusque doctor*, vicar general to Archbishop Gabriele Paleotti from 1568 to 1575 and then bishop of Sarsina from 1581 until his death in 1600. It is therefore difficult to imagine that Paleotti as well - a close collaborator of Morone at Trent - was unaware of the inquiry promoted in his diocese by the leaders of the Roman Holy Office.

The consultants were asked to answer four questions on the basis of the material received from Rome. Giulio Sirenio summarized them as follows: (1) whether the defendant had adhered to the heresies contained

in the *Beneficio di Cristo*; (2) whether he had believed that sacramental confession need not necessarily be made to a priest; (3) whether he had believed that good works performed in the grace of God were not indispensable for obtaining salvation; and (4) whether he had favored heretics 9. Written in technical language, with a redundant apparatus of legal citations, the judgments expressed by the Bolognese consultants largely reflect the new cultural and religious climate of the pontificate of Pius V, which made the benevolent absolutions characteristic of his predecessor's reign seem extremely remote. They also reflect an implicit awareness on the part of many of the writers of what was at stake, of who the not very mysterious abbot was whose heresies they had been asked to assess, and therefore of the expectations of those who had consulted them and, given the times, of their duty if not their desire to conform to those expectations.

"To the first question, whether it must be held that the abbot believed the heresies contained in the *Beneficio di Cristo*, […] I answer in the affirmative" 10. Thus Giovannetti began, observing that the defendant had not only possessed and read the book but also approved it and judged it highly spiritual, even committing the offense of distributing several copies, an act that allowed him to be judged a true heresiarch. The alleged excuse of theological unpreparedness seemed ridiculous to him, since an abbot must know theology and the fundamental articles of the Christian faith as taught by the Church, and since even a woman (as the trial records showed) had been able to perceive the errors in the impious booklet 11. All the more so because the defendant was a prelate who had lived in heretical lands and participated in the Council of Trent, where those doctrines had been discussed and condemned. Regarding sacramental absolution, his *confessio* suggested that he should be considered *suspectus vehementer*, while the evidence of certain witnesses concerning pastoral instructions he had issued showed that "for that reason alone he was a heretic." Giovannetti's judgment of his position on the meritorious value of works was likewise based on numerous quotations from the *confessio* and rejection of the "sordid" justification offered by the defendant, as was his judgment of the complicity with heretics for which the abbot was responsible, moreover corroborated by his bad reputation. His "frivolous excuses" that he had shown benevolence to heterodox persons only so as to convert them sounded entirely implausible, since such conduct was much better explained by the fact that "he was one of them, as he still is." Hence the blunt conclusion that the abbot should be judged "a rotten, impenitent heretic or heresiarch," with no mitigation from the fact that the accusations dated from before the Tridentine decrees, or that many prosecution witnesses were individually uncorroborated regarding the events they reported.

Rolandi's opinion was extremely brief and purely declarative in its assessments, but substantially similar to Giovannetti's (except on the second article, on which the defendant seemed to him only *valde suspectus*). Equally clear was his concluding judgment that if the abbot did not repent he should be punished as a formal heretic and handed over to the secular arm 12. Antonio Gessi was no less severe. He was certain that the prelate was "either a heretic or at least strongly suspected of heresy" regarding the first two points, and frankly heretical regarding the other two, giving no credit whatever to his alleged ignorance of theology and stressing above all the "numerous and repeated acts committed or omitted in favor of heretics." By virtue of his jurisdictional powers, it had been his duty to free the flock entrusted to him from heresy and punish heretics, "and since he did not do so, it may be said that he was an accomplice in those heresies" 13. Giacomo Venenti's opinion was more cautious. On the basis of a series of meticulous legal premises, and without examining the individual charges on their merits, he concluded that the abbot was far from free of suspicion and should be treated accordingly, likewise emphasizing that ignorance "of matters pertaining to one's office never excuses its holder" 14. The principle that every priest was bound to know sacred Scripture was also reaffirmed by Camillo Castellani in his detailed opinion "on the trial of a heretic" (as a marginal note reads). It overflowed with doctrine and canon-law citations, but also revealed a certain embarrassment when he invoked God's help in guiding him through so delicate a question and professed to submit his opinion to the authority of the Church "two, three, four, a thousand times, as often as necessary" 15. His judgment of the defendant was severe: *vehementer suspectus* regarding the first two charges and heretical regarding the third ("if he understood - as I believe - what he was saying about the meritorious value of works") and the fourth, though with some reservations about the admissibility of certain depositions in the record.

The series of jurists closed with Annibale Grassi, more cautious than his colleagues in raising doubts and reservations. He was convinced that possession and distribution of the *Beneficio di Cristo* did not violate the provisions of the Indexes of Paul IV and Pius IV, since the abbot had read the booklet before their publication, and that he could be judged *graviter suspectus* only if the heresies it contained were evident 16. He left that issue to the tribunal's judgment. Regarding the second question too, Grassi suggested the possibility that the defendant was free of suspicion, since the instructions on confession he had addressed to his vicar could be interpreted in a Catholic sense. Such a solution seemed more difficult with respect to the third charge, because the statement to Salmerón "that for the best work he ever performed he deserved hell, as when he went to say Mass," rendered him *vehementer suspectum*. The same applied to the fourth charge, on the basis of substantial agreements between his *confessio* and certain depositions. Grassi's caution emerged above all in questioning the validity of single witnesses who had themselves formerly been tried for heresy, such as Scotti, in emphasizing contradictions among them, and in formulating a series of legal reservations about their cumulative capacity to establish the defendant's public reputation for heresy, thereby undermining the overall credibility and legal admissibility of the prosecution evidence.

Although far from benevolently exculpatory, Grassi's problematic opinion did not stand alone. Some of the theologians consulted also adopted moderate or doubtful positions, beginning with the Servite Fra Cirillo of Bologna. In his view the defendant was *vehementer suspectus* regarding the first article, since the booklet in question was full of heresies he could not have failed to perceive, "knowing sacred Scripture very well," especially as he had lived for a long time in heretical territory, "reading and keeping books with him" 17. The same applied to the second and fourth articles, while the incriminating phrase in the third charge was to be branded impious and heretical; but it was necessary to ascertain whether he had really spoken those words and in what sense. Having said this, however, Fra Cirillo took care to distinguish

between the individual charges and the person of the abbot; to refer back to the interrogations (whose records had evidently not been sent to Bologna) in order to determine his actual awareness of his heterodox deviations; to raise certain reservations - partly similar to Grassi's - about the reliability of the witnesses ("they are all single witnesses […], and some are discredited persons who have abjured"); and to urge consideration of the periods to which the accusations referred, since many of them predated Trent and thus belonged to a season of uncertainty that might also have been reflected in the defendant's statements and conduct. Hence his advice that the accused be subjected to a careful examination, since only through it could the truth emerge clearly and provide the judges with the answers they sought concerning his actual guilt.

Giulio Sirenio likewise thought it appropriate to analyze carefully every possible circumstance of form and substance that might mitigate the defendant's responsibility. Although he too observed that the man's rank as a prelate, his experiences beyond the Alps, and his participation in religious colloquies and in the council cast doubt on his pleas of theological incompetence, he placed at the center of the question whether those errors, evident in themselves, had been "of the mind alone and not of the will" [18]. There was no doubt that in the latter case he should be deemed "a most putrid heretic," though in Sirenio's judgment (as in Fra Cirillo's) that fact could be established only through further examinations. Hence his mild conclusion that the accused abbot should not be considered a heretic or suspect if the matter involved only an intellectual error, but should instead be deemed "a repugnant heretic if his opinion also arose from a malicious will" with respect to the first three charges, and either *leviter* or *vehementer* suspect (in the two respective cases) with respect to the fourth.

Far more severe was the penetrating judgment of Fra Lucio Anguissola. For the familiar reasons advanced by many of his colleagues, he too was ready to exclude the possibility that so authoritative a prelate could in any way be excused on grounds of supposed ignorance, and inclined to see in the compromising statements and conduct charged against him clear signs of adherence to the doctrines of "the apostate and unfrocked Martin Luther, if not to even worse heresies" (even Lutherans, he stressed, would not have dared "affirm that works performed in the grace of God are sins") [19]. After also refuting the legal objections concerning the singularity of the witnesses and the fact that in many cases they were heretics who had abjured, his conclusion was therefore categorical: "From the first and third articles I deduce that the abbot is a heretic; from the second and fourth, that he is strongly suspected of heresy." No more benevolent was the voice of Fra Girolamo da Fano, who began by observing that the defendant's *confessio* alone was sufficient to judge him a heretic or strongly suspected [20]. Although Fra Girolamo had never read the *Beneficio di Cristo*, he did not think it permissible to doubt that approving and distributing it "in his parish" was an offense sufficient to make the accused "without doubt a heretic, indeed almost a heresiarch," just as the grave statements underlying the third charge left no uncertainty that he was not only a heretic but a pertinacious one. His opinion on the second charge was no different: the evidence in the record fully documented that this "almost bishop" was competent in theological matters, having participated in religious colloquies and in the Council of Trent under Paul III, and was all the more culpable because his imprudent pastoral provisions had been issued at a time when they could be misunderstood, "to the gravest danger of souls." As for the final question raised by the Roman Holy Office, Fra Girolamo concluded that this "wretched abbot" should be regarded as "a supporter of heretics," and as such *vehementer suspectus*, on account of the grave negligence and complicity that the prosecution evidence demonstrated with unmistakable clarity.

Equally harsh, finally, was the opinion of the vicar Angelo Peruzzi. He too began from the premise that the defendant was an educated man, conscious of what he was doing, and that his efforts to circulate the *Beneficio di Cristo* therefore justified judging him a perverse "master and doctor of heresies, and consequently punishable as such." On the second point he likewise considered him *vehementer suspectus*; on the third he did not hesitate to define him formally as a heretic; and on the fourth as nothing less than a heresiarch, "worse than the heretics themselves." Hence his conclusion that the dossier sent from Rome required him to be treated "as a formal heretic, a master of heresies" [21].

Valuable for understanding how the trial evidence against Morone could be read, the opinions of the Bolognese canonists and theologians, taken as a whole, proposed a severe condemnation of the accused

abbot. On the four articles submitted to them they reached the nearly unanimous judgment that he was formally a heretic or strongly suspected of heresy, and at times even a heresiarch. In many of them there is an evident desire to conform to the wind blowing from Rome, to please the pontiff, and to display the utmost severity in pursuing heretics. Only Fra Cirillo da Bologna expressed a few faint reservations, and only Giulio Sirenio raised serious doubts, convinced that the anonymous defendant could be called a “repugnant heretic” only if a clear “malicious will” emerged during the trial. Marginal though they were, those doubts, reservations, and perplexities nevertheless sounded like an invitation to caution, even if it is difficult to believe that they could in any way have shaken Pope Ghislieri’s rock-solid certainties about Morone’s inveterate heresies. No document, in any event, makes it possible to establish what use was made of those opinions in Rome, or to what extent they helped accelerate or instead restrain the initiative to reopen the cardinal’s trial.

What is certain is that in that same year, 1570, Giulio Antonio Santoro, Pius V’s right-hand man in directing the Inquisition, was raised to the purple, and that under his personal supervision and at the pope’s command a meticulous *Summarium processus originalis* of Morone was compiled [22]. It proves beyond any doubt that the Holy Office had resumed with fresh vigor its scrutiny of those papers, preparing extracts, covering their margins with comments and notes, and assembling new material. Yet, so far as can be seen, no formal measure was taken, and the Milanese cardinal did not have to endure the humiliation of another imprisonment in Castel Sant’Angelo. There may have been thought of a political trial connected with his responsibility in the Carafa affair [23], but it was probably not overlooked that this could be understood as a personal persecution, a sort of mean and belated revenge destined only to discredit those who carried it out. On the other hand, Pius V’s conviction that this eminent cardinal was (or at least had been) a heretic and a supporter of heretics was too old and deeply rooted for him to be satisfied with some expedient perhaps capable of gratifying private animosity but incapable of sanctioning an unappealable theological judgment. More than a year later, in July 1571, the Spanish ambassador in Rome, once again pressing for a final condemnation of Carranza that would not disavow the Spanish proceedings, urged Pius V not to leave behind the memory of a man who as cardinal had absolved Morone and as pope the archbishop of Toledo, knowing full well that he was pouring vinegar into a still-bleeding wound: “His conscience is greatly troubled by having absolved Morone,” he reported to Philip II [24].

And yet, despite everything - despite the evidence accumulated in the inquisitorial archive over almost twenty years, and despite the absolute certainty regarding the grave doctrinal deviations for which the cardinal was held responsible - Pope Ghislieri ultimately refrained from formally reopening the trial. What prevented him was probably not the embarrassment of having to contradict the signature he had placed beneath the sentence of acquittal, nor the persistence of doubts or reservations like those expressed by some of the Bolognese jurists and theologians he consulted in 1570, but rather the reasons of history, which once again undertook to refute those of theology. How, indeed, could the contradictions between the pontificates of Paul IV and Pius V on the one hand, and those of Julius III and Pius IV on the other, be laid bare at the very moment when an image of the papacy was being constructed as the indefectible guide of the Roman Church and supreme guardian of the truths of faith? How could the sentence of a successor of Peter be repudiated after Trent had raised apostolic tradition to the status of a source of Revelation equal in dignity to the word of God, and after the very validity of the conciliar decrees had been made dependent on papal approval? How could it be admitted that the pontiffs of the previous quarter-century had been elected with the participation of a perverse follower of Luther lurking within the Sacred College? How could the Council of Trent avoid being discredited if it became public that it had been presided over by a heterodox prelate? How could the theological and reforming decisions of a *sacrosancta synodus* be legitimized if its president had been a covert propagator of the poisonous doctrines condemned there, a fifth column of the heresiarchs beyond the Alps?

Those insurmountable contradictions had already been fully understood in 1565 by the Bolognese jurist Alessandro Casali, brother of Vincenzo, very close to Morone, but also a member of Cardinal Carpi’s household and a consultant to the Holy Office, a confidant of the Spanish ambassador Don Luis de

Requesens, and a trusted man of Michele Ghislieri [25]. On the eve of the latter's election he had in fact foreseen the harsh opposition to Morone by the cardinals of Paul IV under "the pretext of the old accusations" [26], while observing that:

the sentence of Pius IV, confirmed and signed by Cardinals Puteo and Alessandrino with the universal assent and consent of the whole College of Cardinals, declares him not merely innocent but in no respect even under suspicion; moreover, his having been the author, director, and mediator of so great an ecumenical council, in which anyone who does not believe is a heretic, ought to put to death every suspicion and envy, besides which it would be almost to declare the council itself null. Nor does Christian piety allow us to believe that blessed God would have wished, through a heretic, to confirm and reform the dogmas of the faith and the abuses of the Church, or to use a bad instrument for a good and holy effect. He has also been accused of promising clerical marriage to the emperor, and yet it is clear that the instruction carried to His Imperial Majesty [in 1565] by the archbishop of Lanciano [Leonardo Marini] and [Pietro] Guicciardini, which many here at court have seen because of this calumny, excludes and condemns clerical marriage; and that instruction was composed, and can be seen written, in Morone's own hand.

To arrest him again and officially revive those old accusations of heresy would mean nothing less than making explicit the contradictions and conflicts that for thirty years had divided and torn apart the highest ranks of the Church. It was better to draw a veil of silence over them than to imagine that they could be erased by a sensational (and ultimately irresponsible) gesture. Even so unyielding an inquisitor as Pius V had to hesitate and finally stop, compelled for once to stray from the "straight road" 27 and yield to the effective reality of things. He continued to make use of the consummate diplomatic ability of that elderly cardinal tormented by gout 28 in order to forge the Holy League with Venice and Spain, and, as *protector Germaniae* [29], to guide the Holy See's German policy, which in 1566 had to endure confirmation of the clauses of the Peace of 1555 by the new Diet of Augsburg. The decision to bend and accept that, at least in this case, reasons of politics should prevail over those of theology was undoubtedly a bitter mouthful for the *summus et perpetuus inquisitor* who had become Pope Pius V and was incapable of viewing history except *sub specie religionis*. Yet, whether he liked it or not, he had to swallow it, without dwelling too much on the fact that truth as he conceived it always needs compromises, and sometimes lies, to defend itself against history's inevitable rejoinders.

Documents and opinions therefore continued to accumulate; that immense body of prosecution evidence continued to be read and reread, every word distilled from it, perhaps with the growing and frustrating awareness that the more it seemed to offer certain proof of Morone's heresy, the more unusable it became and the more it had to be kept hidden, lest untimely storms be stirred up and wounds reopened that were now beginning to heal, as the very election of Pius V demonstrated. With Trent concluded, the theological and disciplinary norms of Catholic orthodoxy defined, and the composition of the Sacred College itself gradually transformed, the success of the intransigent line mapped out by Carafa thirty years earlier now appeared solid and enduring. What purpose, then, would be served by digging up again the errors and deviations that had contaminated the Church, denouncing the disagreements and fractures that had marked a season of uncertainty, revealing the grave dangers that had been run, and casting doubt on the authority of a hierarchy now united in its doctrinal and pastoral choices? These were presumably the reasons that induced the pontiff to abandon the project, though he continued to brood over it at least until 1570-71, if not until his death on 1 May 1572, without ever reconciling the reasons of an exemplary testimony to truths claimed by religion with those of the wise prudence suggested by politics, which ultimately prevailed.

Yet the ghosts of the spirituali continued to hover in the secret rooms of the Holy Office even after Pius V's death. This is suggested by a short summary of the evidence of heresy against Vittoria Colonna, Marcantonio Flaminio, Alvise Priuli, and Reginald Pole attached to Morone's trial dossier, from which it appears that the new investigations promoted by Pope Ghislieri had not been without results. It stated that the Roman noblewoman's letters had proved full "of suspicion and bad phrasing and perhaps also, in the opinion of some, of heresy"; that "there are so many depositions in the Holy Office that Flaminio was a most thoroughly lost heretic that no one who sees them can have any doubt"; that in Priuli's case, besides "many grave indications and depositions of witnesses," a writing had been found "censured not only as suspect but

as heretical"; that the proceedings against Carnesecchi clearly showed that "Donna Giulia [Gonzaga], the Marchioness of Pescara, Flaminio, and Priuli were heretics and were so regarded by him," notwithstanding the many lies he had told to protect "certain lords and friends of his"; and that with respect to the cardinal of England, "besides the very grave old indications, indications have emerged during the time of our lord Pius V that weigh heavily against him" [30]. Illustrious figures, all long dead except Morone, who for that very reason had become Pope Ghislieri's principal inquisitorial target, a symbol of the struggle to which he had devoted his entire life and by virtue of which he had risen to the tiara.

But Pius V had to relinquish the destruction of that symbol once and for all, and at his death Morone was still dean of the Sacred College, surrounded by uncommon prestige. He would survive him by eight years, after carrying out new and important assignments in the service of the Roman Church, respected by all, if only for the weight of great history accumulated upon his shoulders and the role he had played in it. Yet to anyone who wished to scrutinize his conscience or understand the final destination of his religious sensibility, he always remained an indecipherable "Saint Patrick's well" [31], as though petrified in his cardinalatial rank and in the great dignity with which he knew how to live and represent it until the end of his days, despite everything, in a Roman curia very different from the one in which, just over thirty years old, he had received the red hat from the hands of Paul III.

[2]. The New Episcopate of Modena

Within the vast body of scholarship devoted to the reception of Trent and the reforming activity of Italian bishops [32], the case of Giovanni Morone and his two episcopates in Modena is at once unique and emblematic. The cardinal's episcopal experiences in Emilia form a kind of disturbing diptych centered on the failure of the Valdesian experiment and the inquisitorial trial that arose from it. On the one hand, it reflects the hopes and unrealized potential of that "heterodox pastoral ministry" which the Milanese prelate and other bishops attempted in the 1530s and 1540s, with all the limitations of an experiment conducted against a long tradition of absenteeism and moral, sacramental, and liturgical neglect [33]. On the other hand, it highlights the very modest results of postconciliar reform in the dioceses, where Rome's decision to mute pastoral renewal in favor of centralization and repressive control soon made its effects felt. Morone's Modena could thus at first become a laboratory of commitment to the care of souls and the containment of heterodoxy; and, only a few decades later, an early recipient of the Tridentine decrees, with the foundation of the seminary, the convocation of synods, and pastoral visitations. Yet the pivot of these two scenarios was not so much a council fiercely opposed by the intransigent defenders of Roman orthodoxy as the rise to power of the Holy Office. In 1542 it thwarted Morone's irenic experiment with the Modenese academicians, and in 1568 it presided over the iron application of Pius V's edict, which within a short time crushed what remained of the heterodox groups hidden in the "city of every heresy" [34].

Perhaps no prelate more than Giovanni Morone, the "man of the council" [35], bore in his own flesh the apparently irreducible duality of the two faces of Italy's sixteenth-century religious crisis, which in a short time was transformed from a fertile field of hopes for renewal into an immovable rock of obedience and conformity. And perhaps no Italian city more than Modena tasted the nuances of freedom and suffered the harshness of constraint during Morone's two episcopates and that of Foscarari (1550-64), later dismissed by the Roman Holy Office in the peremptory terms with which, on 5 December 1571, Cardinal Giovan Francesco Gambara wrote of it to the new Dominican ordinary - and former inquisitor - Sisto Visdomini of Como [36]:

That city [Modena], perhaps because of some residue of old seeds, needs a very careful and diligent pastor who knows how to mix dexterity with severity and use each when necessary; all the more because it is judged that the late bishop of Modena, your predecessor [Foscarari], by wishing always to employ mildness and gentleness, did not do all that he might have done in the service of his church. Your Lordship knows that the Holy Office usually places great reliance on bishops created from the order of inquisitors; therefore, if such men did not perform their duty, it would be less harmful either to have no bishops at all or to have bishops in whom the Holy Office did not trust. I wished to tell you this so that you might remember to repay the confidence placed in you.

Morone had resigned the diocese in mid-November 1550, while reserving for himself “half of the revenues, namely [1],500 scudi for himself, 300 to be distributed among his household *ad nominationem suam*, and a pension of 70 scudi for Messer Mariano [Vittori], his philosopher,” as a Roman newsletter reported [37]. In the eyes of the congregation that in those same years had placed the diocese of Bergamo under commission after Soranzo’s trial, the pauperistic rigor of the moral and administrative reform established by Foscarari - anything but heterodox - had acquired the features of a “mild” and “gentle” experiment.

In this climate the room for action available to Morone was extremely narrow. He returned to lead the diocese in February 1564, but remained there only for brief periods [38], in part because Pope Pius V would not allow him to leave Rome while deciding what to do with him in inquisitorial terms [39]. The numerous and burdensome curial duties 40 assigned to Morone by Pius V at the very moment when he was considering bringing him once again before the Holy Office were in fact incompatible with the episcopal obligations established by the Tridentine canons, beginning with residence: preaching as the “principal duty of bishops,” convening provincial councils and diocesan synods, carrying out pastoral visitations, and establishing seminaries for the education of the clergy. Doubts and unresolved problems remained about the concrete exercise of all these obligations when they were applied in the dioceses [41]. On the verge of being investigated again, Morone understood perfectly that the Holy Office’s rise to the summit of the Church’s judicial and political system had also placed a mortgage on the autonomy of episcopal action. Added to this were the many constraints that conditioned realization of the pastoral model emerging from Trent: the exemption of the mendicant orders from the ordinary’s authority; financial straits, also caused by heavy pensions charged against episcopal revenues; the survival of an untouchable benefice system; interference of every kind (such as apostolic visitations, which soon became routine); constant jurisdictional subordination to the numerous Roman appellate tribunals, with the resulting impunity of a local clergy encouraged to evade every form of renewal; and deprivation of the power to absolve those suspected of heresy *in foro conscientiae*, although the council had granted bishops that prerogative [42].

The substantial failure of pastoral government over the secular clergy and over the broad margins of autonomy retained by the regular clergy would follow. It was no accident that so zealous a reforming bishop as Gabriele Paleotti professed discouragement about implementing the conciliar decrees in Bologna [43]. An exemplary representative of a generation of post-Tridentine prelates that was quickly exhausted, Paleotti was embittered and sometimes exasperated by the lack of resources [44], by the treatment inflicted on him by Pope Ghislieri’s ministers [45], and by the harassment he had to suffer from a city governor who arrogated to himself the right to arbitrate relations between the ordinary, the Roman congregations, and the pope, in effect removing the clergy from episcopal authority [46]. As if that were not enough, he also had to endure the disgrace of seeing his family dishonored by internal conflicts within the Bolognese legation and by the hostility of Pius V, while Morone - his constant Roman point of reference [47] - was always ready to intervene as far as he could [48].

The framework within which Morone’s second episcopate in Modena unfolded thus saw post-Tridentine bishops operating, when not with a muted resistance to reform, through “more an absence than a presence” [49], against the background of the centralizing and hierocratic project promoted by Rome. This project led, for example, to basing the rapid canonization of so singular a figure in many respects as Carlo Borromeo on the suppression of a teaching entirely devoted to asserting the fullness of the episcopal office [50]. There can be no doubt that the growing restrictions imposed on the exercise of episcopal authority and its impulses toward renewal discouraged residence in the dioceses, especially among cardinals, who were increasingly occupied by the work of the Roman congregations. So it was with Morone, who stayed in Modena only sporadically: from July 51 to September 1565; in February 52 and April-May 1568 [53]; and in July 54 and until late September 1571 [55]. Another journey to Modena, for which he received the pope’s “permission” on 8 April 1570, had to be postponed because of his continual attacks of “migraine” [56]. This contradicts the assertion that “the observance of the residence obligation by the majority of Italian bishops was aided considerably by the example of leading members of the Sacred College, such as Cardinal Giovanni Morone or Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, who left Rome to move to their dioceses” [57]. Indeed, the appeal of an old acquaintance of the

Milanese cardinal, Fra Reginaldo Nerli, went unheeded when on 14 December 1565 he urged Morone to reside "*iuxta praeceptum divinum* in his bishopric of Modena" [58], invoking the divine-right doctrine that the cardinal had vigorously opposed during the council [59].

In practice, Morone constantly entrusted the pastoral government of the Emilian diocese to a vicar. On 9 September 1564 he appointed to that office the Modenese cleric Gasparo Silingardi [60], then twenty-seven years old, who in 1582 would become bishop of Ripatransone and in 1593 be promoted to the see of his native city. This situation also gave rise to the cardinal's unsuccessful attempt to transfer the diocese to his nephew Girolamo Gallarati [61], who in 1565 had been moved from the diocese of Sutri and Nepi to that of Alessandria, where he immediately undertook a pastoral visitation, convened a diocesan synod, and the following year founded a seminary for training the clergy [62]. As an exchange of letters between uncle and nephew in the autumn of 1566 shows [63], Gallarati was reluctant to accept the proposal and leave "the affairs of this bishopric [of Alessandria] so disordered in every part," even though "the scant hope […] of setting them right, and continual experience of the difficulties and dangers involved in governing others," made him wish "to be free both of this bishopric and of every other." Catalano Gallarati's son therefore refused to comply with his uncle's wishes,

> considering that in every state there is work to be done, and although in Alessandria the air is damp and thick [*sic*] and the people shrewd and fierce […], Modena is no better, and surpasses it in burden because it has greater jurisdiction and more disturbance from frequent passage; and there is also the fact that succeeding the late Bishop Foscarari, a man of such learning, such goodness, and so exemplary a life, ought to daunt any capable man, let alone me, who find myself so poor in all these qualities.

One element of discontinuity between Morone's two Modenese episcopates was the improvement in relations with the Este duke Alfonso II, to whom on 6 January 1560 - directly from the conclave - he sent a letter of condolence on the death of his father [64]. At the end of that year the prince recognized, by virtue of the powers granted to Morone as bishop of Modena, his right to dispose of the commendam of the abbey of Frassinoro, then vacant, which Morone bestowed on his nephew Galeazzo despite Borromeo's ambitions [65]. Shortly afterward the duke allowed him to take possession of and collect the revenues from other Modenese benefices formerly occupied by Cardinal Carlo Carafa and promptly claimed by Morone after "his miserable fate" [66]. The Este ruler proved equally attentive in subsequent years, whether in executing a pious bequest in favor of a Dominican convent, an order of which Morone was protector [67]; accepting his recommendations, such as that on behalf of "a prisoner in Modena for debt" 68 and that of the inquisitor Camillo Campeggi [69]; or responding to invitations to enforce the sumptuary laws [70]. He received the same consideration when he in turn requested favors in Rome [71]. It is therefore unsurprising that when Morone expressed his sorrow over Foscarari's death, the duke immediately addressed the question of succession, declaring that both for himself and for the people of Modena it would be a great "boast and honor if the burden of the bishopric remained upon you" [72].

[3]. The Diocesan Synod

The most significant result of Morone's reforming efforts in Modena during the 1560s was the meeting of the first diocesan synod, the instrument of pastoral government that the Council of Trent had sought to revitalize by making its periodic convocation obligatory. Almost everywhere, however, such assemblies ultimately acquired a predominantly legal character, issuing regulations and constitutions that translated the conciliar norms into local terms and performed a function of simplifying and disseminating canon law. The working methods of the brief synodal meeting itself - entirely centered on the reading without discussion and subsequent promulgation of articles prepared by a commission presided over by a canonist - reveal its eminently bureaucratic character [73]. Convened by Morone in July 1565, the diocesan synod of Modena was among the first to be held, after the dozen or slightly more convened the previous year in other Italian cities. Published by the Gadaldino press in Modena, Morone's *Constitutiones* listed in more than 180 pages the duties and rules of conduct of the clergy, repeatedly reaffirmed both before and afterward, evidence of ancient and persistent violations of the rules [74]. They also received favorable notice in Rome. On 3 November

1565 Guglielmo Sirleto wrote to Carlo Borromeo that he had “heard much praise of the synod held under our most illustrious lord Cardinal Morone,” although he had not yet seen its acts [75]. The conduct of the assembly - in which laymen also participated - is indirectly documented by the *Constitutiones*, whose anonymous preface reminded the clergy and people of Modena of the achievements their bishop had won at Trent. Although modeled on the Tridentine decrees and therefore not a reliable observatory of the bishop’s positions on pastoral government, those norms nevertheless offer evidence that is to some extent indicative of his reforming sensibility.

In the address delivered to his flock at the opening of the first session, Morone urged everyone to renew their religious practice and the clergy in particular to remedy their many shortcomings. “In the Church (as you all know), moral discipline has now collapsed,” he began, referring to a context broader than Modena alone [76]. After apologizing for his precarious health and the resulting brevity of his speech, he explained that the synod’s principal aim was to secure universal acceptance of the conciliar decrees, emphasizing their chief doctrinal and normative points, with particular stress on the obligation of residence [77]. The concise oration ended with a tribute to Foscarari’s memory, under the sign of an ideal continuity that - as will be seen - would echo ominously in the rooms of the Roman inquisitors [78]. The synod then proceeded with the notary’s reading of the Tridentine dogmatic decrees and an order that those present not leave the city without the bishop’s consent. The second session, opened the same day, began - as prescribed by the council - with an oath of obedience to the pontiff and an explicit condemnation of the heretical assertions listed in the conciliar decree read by the notary. This was followed by the election of the synodal examiners, charged with pastoral supervision of the parish churches of the city and diocese, and the designation of clerics who would assist the bishop in judging ecclesiastical cases [79]. The third and fourth sessions, held the following day, saw the reading of the disciplinary canons approved at Trent, divided into four categories (canons; rural deans and regular and secular parish priests; regular clerics alone; and finally the laity). Particular stress was placed on the provisions concerning clerical morality and the bishop’s reservation of certain cases, whose list was read. At the close, Archpriest Aurelio Bellencini published the list of those in contempt, whose names were to be posted on the church doors with the obligation to appear before the vicar in the following days under penalty of excommunication [80].

Finally, the synod appointed those responsible for founding the new seminary, on the basis of the Tridentine decree - inspired also by Giberti’s Veronese example and Pole’s proposal at the London synod of 1556 [81] - that colleges be established in every city and diocese under two priests, one appointed by the bishop and the other by the clergy. Its duties and organizational structure were also discussed, at the very moment when the Roman Seminary, founded in February 1565, was providing an enduring model [82]. Work on establishing the Modenese seminary began slowly. In two letters to the cathedral canons on 13 July and 10 August 1566, the bishop complained that nothing had yet been done [83]. Yet before the end of the year it proved possible to found it in a building adjoining the cathedral, as Trent prescribed [84]. At Trent Morone had expressed the view that the presence of both a seminary and a Jesuit college in the same city was redundant. In mid-1563 he had informed Laínez that the establishment of “a very large seminary in Rome, to assist every nation,” did not seem appropriate to him, since the Roman and German Colleges were already there. After the session of 26 July, however, the papal legates wrote to Borromeo suggesting that the pope found a seminary in the capital as a model for other dioceses. Pius IV accordingly created the new institution in 1564, again entrusting it to the Jesuits and assigning it an annual subsidy of [6],000 scudi from the Apostolic Camera. Morone himself would later facilitate admission to the Roman seminary for young members of families connected with him, including families from Modena [85].

It should be emphasized that the synodal *Constitutiones* were preceded by a careful assessment of conditions in the territory, conducted in rural areas and especially in the mountains, capable of illustrating “with singular vividness” the human, social, and political characteristics of the diocese [86]. An account of this preparatory analysis of the synod, commissioned by the bishop, is supplied by two small books of notes and observations on the parishes, the *Visita della diocesi di Modona* and the *Discorso sopra la diocesi di Modana*. Both date to 1565 and were almost certainly composed by the Conventual Franciscan Girolamo

Tinelli of Montalcino, rector of Finale from 1550-51, the year in which he had reconciled various heretics. For more than a decade the friar delegated by Morone to visit the diocese had devoted himself to improving ecclesiastical structures and religious life in the Modenese territory, receiving from Foscarari in 1557 the title of visitor general. Morone's two-stage reforming strategy, designed to graft the synod's decrees onto the concrete reality revealed by the pastoral visitation, is reflected in the sequence of the two texts: the *Visita* presents the results of a preliminary investigation of the territory, later synthesized in the *Discorso*, which in turn served as a prelude to the synod held in the autumn. It was a rigorous approach, typical of Morone's rationality in carrying out his governmental duties. The complex of initiatives that combined preparation and execution of the first pastoral visitation with the convocation of the diocesan synod constituted for the cardinal an initial test of the results of Trent. It was no accident that one of the most evident aims of the *Discorso* was to reform the diocese's territorial organization by reorganizing the twenty-six "congregations," as the surviving units of the ancient parish structure were called: groups of neighboring churches governed by a rural dean accountable to the bishop. Foscarari had already recorded the malfunctioning of this system and had hoped in vain for the cathedral chapter's assistance in instituting periodic meetings of the rural clergy [87]. In accordance with the investigation conducted during the pastoral visitation, the synod decreed a territorial reorganization of the Modenese Church, appointing substitute priests to perform the functions of negligent rural deans. Another issue emerging from Tinelli's preparatory work - likewise already central to Foscarari's concerns - was the need to pacify urban feuds, an endemic problem Morone had been forced to confront twenty years earlier as legate of Bologna [88]. Here too, in 1565, he put Tinelli's admonitions to use by devoting a chapter of the synodal constitutions, *De pace*, to peace among both clergy and laity. Without introducing any substantial novelty, it established that each parish priest should watch over the faithful to prevent discord; when disputes arose, he was to remind the parties of the Gospel precepts and call on friends and relatives to promote reconciliation. In insoluble cases provision was made for referral to the rural dean or to one or more parishioners, and for intervention by the bishop.

In Modena, family and neighborhood rivalries, sometimes fueled by bitter disputes over possession of ecclesiastical revenues and property, were compounded by the jurisdictional competition between the bishopric and the abbey of Nonantola. At the end of 1563 Foscarari appealed precisely to Morone, asking him, in collaboration with Borromeo, the holder of that commendam, to address "the disorder and ugliness found in that place on account of the diversity of this government" [89]. The case the cardinal had to resolve on that occasion concerned the small town of Spilamberto in the countryside southeast of the city, where two churches only a few meters apart - one subject to the abbot of Nonantola, the other to the bishop of Modena - competed for the faithful amid "perpetual dissensions and discord, not without scandal to the people." These measures were certainly not enough to restore order in the poor and quarrelsome countryside, still less in the mountains. Disorders connected with conflicting parish and jurisdictional allegiances continued to be recorded, along with clashes and scandals often caused by an untrained and immoral clergy, incapable of caring either for the souls of the faithful or for sacred buildings, frequently occupied instead with private and family interests, when not devoted to every kind of vice.

Although the visitation of 1565 also revealed encouraging cases - such as that of San Felice sul Panaro, where "Don Lodovico, the archpriest, is competent, good, and diligent: may God make them all so; this church used to be the worst of all because of the priests; now it is excellent in every respect; services are conducted diligently, and life is also most honorable" [90] - reports of grave negligence, abuse, corruption, violence, simony, and abysmal ignorance were exceedingly numerous. Concubinage was widespread everywhere, often with children, and at times assumed the form of anomic dissolution, as some terse shorthand notes from the visitation attest. The subdeacon of San Felice, for example, Giovan Battista da Carpi, "has taken a woman, and also wished to take another and then another: a vagabond, competent, of good intelligence, of the worst life; favor protects him; he pursues warfare, handles money, lives freely." Also at San Felice, Don Giovanni Foffo was judged "mad and wicked, foul-mouthed, unchaste, accused several times, corrected but never reformed; indeed, after a severe correction was administered to him last year in the presence of the priests, the following night he was found naked at Sasso in the house of a woman with whom he had often associated." In the *Discorso* Tinelli informed Morone that "many - indeed almost

all, or a good part - of the older priests have children," and in any case were "heads of households, partly because of the death of brothers, partly by their own choice." Most churchmen were moreover obliged to care for various "nephews" or found themselves entangled in other "worldly affairs," abandoning their studies to "go to markets" and "lead the animals to be sold with their own hands" [91]. There was no counting the priests who trafficked in sacred things, sometimes through magical and superstitious practices, forever hunting for money and addicted to gambling and wine. Churches were often ruined and filthy, converted into stables or warehouses, with collapsed roofs and doors torn away; ecclesiastical property was everywhere usurped, alienated, or reduced to private use [92].

The synodal *Constitutiones* of 1565 attempted to remedy this devastation - perhaps also caused by the fact that, unlike Giberti, Morone had not succeeded from his first Modenese episcopate onward in surrounding himself with assistants recruited elsewhere, relying instead on those already present in the diocese [93]. Thus, for example, they ordered the clergy not to alienate their dignities and canonries, reminding them that "the house of God is a house of prayer and not of commerce"; to maintain dignified conduct in choir, to genuflect and not turn their backs on the altars during services, not to sleep when they should be singing, to administer benefices carefully and perform the functions attached to them regularly, to dress decorously inside and outside sacred places, to abstain from hunting, dancing, and drinking in taverns, and to litigate civil and criminal cases in the proper forums and within reasonable times [94]. After making precise recommendations concerning the duties of those conducting worship, the *Constitutiones* defined the responsibilities of rural deans and parish priests, insisting on the obligation of residence, administration of the sacraments, veneration of sacred images and relics, observance of religious feasts, and morality of conduct. Priests were required to possess an annotated volume of sacred Scripture and certain theological *Summae*, in addition to the Tridentine and synodal decrees. They were urged to practice hospitality and attend to the needs of their parishioners, and parish priests were reminded that assisting the poor was an obligation. Where benefice revenues and alms were insufficient to confront that scourge, they could ask the bishop for permission to pawn gold and silver objects belonging to the Church [95]. Modena's rich body of legislation from 1565 concluded with provisions for the regular clergy and a reminder to princes and magistrates of their duty to respect ecclesiastical jurisdiction and cooperate in the repression of heresy [96].

Morone's second Modenese episcopate also saw a second visitation, conducted by Vicar Silingardi in 1569 - with a slight violation of the Tridentine rule prescribing annual visitations, or biennial ones in the case of an especially large diocesan territory [97] - to more than seventy parishes, rural deaneries, churches, and hospitals, mostly situated in the mountain zone of the diocese, from which nearly all the clergy came [98]. The situation that emerges is no less discouraging than before, although the harsh and severe judgment of the first visitation seems softened in the second, which was limited to the rectors and sometimes the chaplains of the parishes. The residence obligation appears to have been observed by almost all parish priests, but their conduct was often inadequate, with the customary cases of negligence and moral disorder appearing less scandalous, probably because they were recorded with less severity than in the previous visitation. The finding of the clergy's dramatic ignorance, however, was undiminished. Among the laity, the spread of bandits and murderers through the Modenese mountains seems to have been the gravest scourge, alongside endemic concubinage and a few cases of suspected heresy or witchcraft. The visitation of 1569 nevertheless depicts a reality in which the obligation of annual confession and communion was substantially observed and the list of those who had failed to confess was carefully recorded. This demonstrates the effectiveness of a practice that linked sacramental confession with inquisitorial justice [99], attributing failure to receive the Eucharist to situations of concubinage, inextinguishable hatreds and plans for revenge that prevented sacramental absolution, or the existence of marriages within prohibited degrees contracted before the council and not dispensed because of the poverty of those concerned [100].

The Tridentine recommendation that a synod be celebrated annually was not observed in Modena either. Morone convened two more in 1568 and 1571 and had their acts printed [101]. In the latter year he also had a synod convened at Velletri, of which he had become bishop when promoted the previous year to the suburbicarian diocese of Ostia, which he was accustomed to visit annually [102], as he had earlier visited

Palestrina [103]. Further synods were held in Modena in 1572 and 1575 by his successor Sisto Visdomini, a rigorous and bureaucratic post-Tridentine bishop committed to implementing the conciliar norms and the sharp separation between clergy and laity that they imposed. One believer was thereby moved to complain anonymously that “the clergy and the people have no understanding between them; they seem two bodies and not one” [104]. Yet in November 1578 Visdomini too would complain to Morone of the many problems afflicting “this poor Church of Modena and its jurisdiction, against which new usurpations are introduced every day” [105].

The synodal assemblies presided over by Morone in the second half of his term again addressed the obligation of residence, including for holders of nonpastoral benefices, from which - the Milanese cardinal recalled - one could be excused only for grave reasons. The education of the clergy also remained a constant concern. To the books prescribed by the synod of 1565 were added readings from Saint Bernard, Jean Gerson, Saint Augustine, Saint Bonaventure, and Gaspare Loarte, together with the recommendation that clerics meditate upon them and apply them “as true ministers of God and faithful priests” [106]. The bishop had to return to the cleanliness of the altars, still deplorable even in the cathedral [107]; the dress, education, and morality of priests, with an explicit prohibition on women frequenting the homes of canons and other clerics; and the ban on practicing usury [108]. He likewise returned to administration of benefice revenues, preaching, catechetical instruction, and the compulsory use of the missal (just after the printing of the Tridentine edition of 1570), the breviary (approved by Pius V in 1568), and vestments, calendars, and liturgies subject to increasingly minute regulation. These were followed by the privileges of the clergy, administration of the sacraments, and the already mentioned reform of the rural deanery system. During Morone’s second episcopate, rural deans who were often unsuitable were replaced by priests better able to communicate with the diocesan leadership and supervise observance of the synodal canons. This was the first step toward the institution of vicars forane, systematically introduced in the seventeenth century both in the dioceses and in inquisitorial structures, and decreed in Modena by the synod of 1659 [109].

Finally, information on the activity of Modenese confraternities in these years is scarce. The visitation reports mention one active in 1565 in the parish of San Martino di Vallata and dedicated to its eponymous saint, while in 1569 six parishes were recorded as hosting a *Societas Iesu Christi*, of whose promotion by Morone some traces remain. These were presumably confraternities responding to the objectives established by Paul III in the bull *Dominicus noster* (1539), intended to renew devotion to the Eucharist and its administration to the sick [110]. That they were not always models of religious life is attested by a letter of 6 June 1573 in which the Milanese cardinal expressed keen displeasure at the “exorbitance” for which a new company had been responsible [111]. The visitation records contain no information on any intervention by the cardinal in the Modenese network of confraternities and pious institutions, from the refuge for converted women founded by the gentlewoman Laura Beliardi in 1535 to the Company of the Orphan Girls of San Geminiano sponsored by the banker Ludovico Colombo and other prominent citizens in 1532. We do know, however, that during his second episcopate Morone gave a new rule to the “bishop’s girls,” imposing poverty, enclosure, virginity, and regulation of devotion so that “honesty may be preserved in the house by forbidding them to converse together about vain things or to speak with any man” [112]. During those decades the confraternities, often heirs to ancient lay religious associations, had moreover been losing their spiritual characteristics in favor of the patrimonial dimensions of hospitals, leper houses, and orphanages, not without provoking conflicts between rival families over control of the property of charitable institutions. From his first episcopate onward Morone had attempted to moralize hospital administration, and as late as 1542 had clashed with the leading citizens who directed the Santa Unione, without succeeding in reforming it as he wished. His declaration that the Union was invalid proved ineffective in the long term: its statutes were later redefined, and the bishop’s victory resulted only in a principled assertion of ecclesiastical authority, without affecting the administration - which remained firmly lay - of the property and revenues of hospitals and other pious institutions [113].

[4]. The Eradication of Heresy

Morone's second appointment to lead the diocese of Modena took place on 23 February 1564, when the heterodox movement centered on Giovanni Grillenzoni's academy - which in 1542 had escaped the bishop's attempt to restore it to the channel of Catholic orthodoxy - was already nearing exhaustion [114]. One consequence of that failure had been the radicalization of the Modenese "brethren," many of whom arrived at Calvinist positions attested by their celebration of the Lord's Supper. In this rite was expressed the now-conscious ecclesiological otherness of a clandestine community capable of creating organized forms of solidarity and worship protected by well-tested Nicodemite disguises. Its members came from every social group: ordinary weavers, artisans, and schoolmasters, but also wealthy merchants, members of the most illustrious patrician families and of the nobility itself, such as Count Giovanni Rangoni, perhaps the most authoritative of the recognized leaders, the so-called "great ones" [115].

There can be no doubt that the bishop watched with some concern the new escalation of investigations and arrests in his diocese after Pius V's accession. We already know that he and his father had for decades maintained close relations with the most prominent families of the city's nobility, beginning with the Rangoni, often mentioned in the cardinal's inquisitorial trial, with whom bonds of friendship continued during the years of his second Modenese episcopate [116]. His relations with Fulvio Rangoni, son of Claudio and Lucrezia Pico, educated by Don Girolamo Teggia, who had been connected with all the leading exponents of local heterodoxy, would continue even after the end of Morone's episcopate and were sealed, among other things, by the gift of a portrait of his father Claudio [117]. As late as the end of December 1566, shortly before the inquisitorial whirlwind struck the diocese, Morone congratulated Fulvio Rangoni on the "grace" God had granted him in giving him a son, "which," the nobleman replied, "has been very great, because I had desired one for so long" [118].

The relations between the bishop and the city's leading family, suspected of heterodoxy for decades, were not confined during those months to congratulatory formalities. This appears from a letter Rangoni sent a few weeks later, when inquisitorial repression was already raging in Modena and certain "gentlemen" proposed establishing a workhouse on the Bolognese model, openly invoking Foscarari's religious and ideal legacy [119]. Such relations may have been imprudent, like Morone's connection with Benedetto Carandini, a member of a wealthy family linked to the Modenese heterodox movement and denounced for heresy in the second half of the decade. In 1565 Carandini had been involved in certain abuses "of the grain office," for which Morone had refrained from punishing him in consideration of his "good life," even recommending him to Duke Alfonso II. In praising his "special care for the poor," his honesty in keeping the alms of the entire city, his "life blameless until now," and his religious zeal [120], the bishop may well have exposed himself more than was prudent. He did the same with Bartolomeo Pazzani at the height of the judicial cyclone of 1568, soliciting the duke's protection for a poor man burdened with children, one of whom was in prison after "rigorous examinations and torments," and whose sentence awaited only the duke's "reply and favor." Pazzani's father would shortly afterward be denounced in turn [121]. It is possible that after so many years away from Modena, engaged on very different fronts and by then distant from the religious anxieties of the past, Morone knew little - and wished to know even less - about the city's heretical world, and therefore found it difficult to assess people and circumstances. The case of the young Modenese who presented himself with "great contrition" to the city's inquisitor, Fra Domenico da Imola, confessing that he had neither gone to confession nor received communion for thirteen years and asking to be absolved, was not especially alarming, though this could be done only with due authorization because he had been "entangled in certain heresies" [122]. Yet as early as 7 June 1563 the inquisitor had written to the bishop to remind him of the spread and social rootedness of Modenese heresies, beginning with the group that had gathered in the early 1540s around Francesco Porto's Greek lessons [123]. Fra Domenico took care to send Morone a list of them, although he knew that "one could proceed against them only from day to day, whenever they let something slip" [124]. If a deposition at that time portrayed the heretical community as a substantial group of almost thirty persons "who called themselves brethren," "who gathered in Messer Graziano's house and read among themselves," by 1566 the inquisitors' axe had already fallen once, decapitating and dispersing it. In September of that year

the tribunal cited Giovanni Bergomozzi, Piergiovanni Biancolini, Giacomo Graziani, Marco Caula, and Giovanni Maria Tagliadi, known as Maranello, all of whom fled the city; only the last two returned to face trial. Between 1566 and 1567 proceedings were held against Marco Magnavacca, already investigated in 1560 and likewise gone into exile, but arrested with various accomplices by the Bolognese Holy Office, which handed him over to its Modenese counterpart; the latter sent him to the stake in February 1567. Cooperation between the inquisitors of the two cities facilitated investigations and the capture of heretics, and Morone was constantly kept informed of their trials [125]. Also in 1567 Pietro Antonio da Cervia, Giovanni Padovani, and Geminiano Tamburino were arrested. Tamburino revealed to the judges the names of other suspected persons, who soon appeared before the inquisitors. His condemnation, decreed on 31 January 1568, symbolically closed the first phase of inquisitorial repression [126]. "Whether Our Lord's opinion that there is much evil in Modena arises from its old reputation or from some new occasion, I do not know," Domenico da Imola wrote on 7 June 1567; in subsequent letters that year he diligently reported arrests, trials, and condemnations of old and new heretics [127].

It was at this point, at a moment of evident crisis in the heretical movement, that Pius V issued a brief which, with considerable strategic shrewdness, entrusted Morone with the task of definitively crushing all religious dissent in the Emilian city precisely when he himself was effectively coming under investigation again. On 10 February 1568, as the cardinal prepared to travel to Modena to conduct the second pastoral visitation, he received from the pope authority to open the traditional inquisitorial period of grace through "full and free license and power to release and absolve in both forums from all heresies, censures, and penalties" any faithful who had incurred them and wished to return to the bosom of the Church. Anyone who went to the bishop, admitted his faults, and "revealed all his accomplices" would be reconciled after a public or secret abjuration pronounced in the presence of notaries, witnesses, and two "masters of theology" (a presence not required for the absolutions Foscarari had issued under privileges granted by Julius III), together with light salutary penances. For those who did not present themselves before the ordinary, by contrast, the inexorable time of justice would begin. This was the medieval mechanism revived by Pius V, inducing those who feared denunciation to go to the bishop - from whom clemency might be expected - and become informers against themselves and their accomplices [128].

Those who did not come forward spontaneously to denounce themselves were imprisoned, tried, and sometimes tortured. The same occurred at the time in other Italian cities, such as Naples and Mantua, where repression reached the ducal court itself [129], with a predictable increase in extraditions to Rome. "Last Sunday," a Roman newsletter of 22 May 1568 reported, "ten heretics arrived from Naples, and so many appear every day from different places that the prisons cannot hold them" [130]. The confessions obtained on that occasion led Morone to draw up a list of ten persons "abjured in secret" and a summary of "interrogations, abjurations, and sentences" from 1568 [131]. It contained a substantial list of *sponte comparentes*, whose depositions marked the final disintegration of the Modenese community of "brethren," now deprived of every hope that the Reformation might extend into Italy, with its back against the wall and forced into the painful - and in any event losing - choice between dissimulation and exile.

The chronology of those dramatic events clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of edicts of grace. Ercole Cervi and Cosimo Guidoni appeared on 15 March 1568; Francesco Maria Vincenzi on the 16th; Ercole and Giovanni Andrea Manzoli on the 17th. Two days later their brother Francesco and Giulio Cesare Seghizzi followed, and on 21 March Francesco Caldana, Giovanni Antonio Durelli, and Girolamo Comi. On the 23rd came Giovanni Battista Meschiari, Bartolomea Della Porta, and Giacomo Gandolfi; on the 25th Francesco Villanova; on the 27th Ercole Piatesi and Ercole Mignoni. At the end of the month Giulio Abbati, Antonio Villani, and Giovanni Battista Capelli were added; in April Giulio Cesare Pazzani and Ludovico Mazzoni appeared. In two weeks nineteen heterodox persons passed before the bishop, in addition to Francesco Maria Carretta, whom he absolved. Abjurations and sentences were collected and issued with great speed: in most cases the defendants had to wait less than a day to learn the penances imposed on them [132].

While the bishop administered reconciliations, preceded by full confession and denunciation of accomplices, the inquisitors handled the formal trials. These included those against the exile Giulio Sadoleto,

condemned in absentia in October 1570 and deprived of his property two years later, and the relapsed Natale Gioioso, who had already abjured in 1563 and died of exhaustion in early November 1568 while awaiting sentence. His corpse was handed over to the secular arm to be burned at the stake, while the text of the abjuration he was to have pronounced was attached to the record. Other proceedings conducted between March and April 1568 ended with the condemnations of Francesco Bordiga, Martino Savera, Bartolomeo Caura, Bernardino Pellotti called Garapina, Francesco Secchiari, Erasmo Barbieri, Pietro Curioni, and Fulvio Calori. Between March 1568 and October 1569 Antonio Maria Ferrara, Francesco Maria Carretta, and Geminiano Calligari were investigated. The formal trials and spontaneous appearances involved more than thirty "brethren," leaving abjuration or exile as the only routes of escape, since dissimulation and Nicodemism were no longer viable.

The Milanese cardinal thus appears to have collaborated with, or at least placed no obstacle in the way of, the wave of repression unleashed by Pope Pius V. He could hardly have acted otherwise while he himself was under observation by the Holy Office. He continued to act in this direction after returning to Rome, as shown, for example, by his curt response of 2 April 1569 to Count Ercole Rangoni's recommendation on behalf of a "condemned Frenchman." Morone pointed out that it was not for him "either to remove or to moderate or commute the penalty," and that "in such inquisitorial affairs it would be well for you to intervene as little as possible, but leave their care to the superiors, who, knowing the quality of the illness, will impose no medicine other than what is expedient" [133].

There is, however, a slender indication that he gave some protection to at least one of those heretics, Alessandro Milani, one of the few whose religious experience was directly connected with the Academy, of which he had been a member and whom Morone had undoubtedly known as such in the distant year 1542; but also, significantly, a witness who in December 1559 had testified in his favor in the Roman defensive trial [134]. In the *Racconto delle vite d'alcuni letterati del suo tempo*, datable to around 1570, Ludovico Castelvetro wrote that "when the persecution under Pius V was harsher and more rigorous than ever," Milani was denounced and, on learning of it, presented himself to the bishop before being cited and secretly abjured in his hands, only to learn afterward that "this secret abjuration was not to be valid, just as similar secret abjurations had not been valid for others who had made them." This means that, at least in this case, the Milanese cardinal acted exactly as his predecessor had, accepting secret abjurations without involving the inquisitors, to their great irritation. They sent their notary to Milani's house to cite him *ad comparendum*, but then did nothing because they found him at the point of death [135]. It was yet another division of roles in the paradoxical affair that saw the reigning pontiff secretly prosecuting the cardinal whose acquittal he himself had signed only a few years earlier, while at the same time entrusting him with prosecuting heretics in his diocese, though mistrusting his conduct. Once again the red thread of doctrinal rigor became lost in the tortuous labyrinths of historical contingency and double truths.

When Giovanni Morone left the diocese of Modena for the second time in November 1571 [136] - while reserving for himself a pension on the episcopal revenues of no less than [1],400 ducats, and another 300 for four members of his household [137] - the "brethren" had been decimated. The largest and strongest heterodox community to take root in an Italian city amid the fluid spiritual climate that opened at the beginning of the century had been eradicated, and this had occurred in part through the work of the man who, several decades earlier, had unsuccessfully attempted to use the instruments of dialogue and persuasion and had then himself been investigated and arrested. Everything had changed in the meantime, and an age had definitively closed. This was also indicated by the appointment as his successor of the Dominican Sisto Visdomini, who as a former inquisitor offered the Roman curia every guarantee of reliability, as his fellow Dominican and cardinal Vincenzo Giustiniani explained to him [138]:

One of your predecessors - I mean Bishop Egidio - suffered greatly. You, who have the example before your eyes, must take care not to come to such a pass through inadvertence, for I know there is no need to fear malice. I would therefore be of the opinion that Your Lordship should not become too familiar with them, and especially with relatives of those who have been suspected; that you should always remain united with the father inquisitor, especially in the reports to be made to the holy tribunal; that you should also show yourself in every respect the

most bitter enemy of this sort of men, enemies of the faith, and proceed against them with every rigor. For humanity, dissimulation, the wish to proceed benevolently with them, and the thought of overcoming them by reason or persuasion are all wasted, and you would acquire a bad name. Today is a time only for rigor and punishment with this sort of person.

Perhaps it was out of respect for a fellow friar universally recognized as a most learned theologian and holy man that this letter referred only in passing ("I mean Bishop Egidio") to the one who had promoted other and blameworthy strategies in dealing with heretics. Yet it was the iron Pius V who, for once - and with considerable success - followed the path of mildness; and even his faithful Scipione Rebiba declared himself satisfied in April 1568 with Morone's work in repressing heresy in Modena, praising without reserve "his invention and dexterity" [139]. Less than a year later, however, in February 1569 Cardinal Pisa wrote to the inquisitor of Ferrara, Paolo Costabili, urging him to go to Modena for a time in order to "interrogate all those who abjured before the most illustrious Bishop Morone," since there was well-founded suspicion that they had not sincerely named all their accomplices and supporters [140].

Pope Ghislieri's skillful operation, intended to bring the Modenese heretics into the open through a "time of grace" administered by a bishop who had himself been investigated in part for collusion with leading members of the city's heterodox movement, thus had a troubling sequel. In the eyes of the Holy Office - however arbitrary this was in strictly canonistic terms - not all absolutions had the same value. The proceedings against Giacomo Gandolfi, Ercole Manzoli, and Bartolomea Della Porta, who had abjured before Morone in March 1568, would be subjected to close scrutiny in Rome because they were considered unreliable. The disavowal of the bishop was all the more evident because it seemed to end a kind of truce between the Holy Office and the Milanese cardinal, perhaps announcing the renewed investigations against him soon attested by the Bolognese inquiry of 1570 [141]. Two years later, on 26 January 1572, Rebiba ordered Costabili not to trust the generous absolutions granted in the past by Foscarari, "whose actions in that city against heretics are held in no account by this Holy Office" [142]. Here too one has the impression that Morone's name remained unwritten only for reasons of expediency.

Chapter Twenty-Three

“To Govern Well and Holily”: Curial Offices

[1]. Cardinal Protector

In the decades of his maturity, Giovanni Morone devoted a substantial part of his time to exercising the office of protector of religious orders, states, and ecclesiastical institutions. During the early modern centuries and until fairly recent times, protectorates conferred by the pontiffs - sometimes in concert with secular princes - were for cardinals a source of work but also of prestige and power, increasing their political weight. Identifying the protectorates assumed by the Milanese cardinal and tracing the forms in which he exercised them, insofar as the sources permit [1], can therefore contribute to understanding important aspects of his curial role, as well as further clarifying his orientations and networks of influence. Naturally, the general problems of the history of religious orders in these decades will not be addressed here, although the magnifying glass afforded by Morone’s activity between the 1550s and 1570s makes it possible to discern significant moments in their historical development. These were important developments, marked by the birth of new orders and the crises, resistance, or metamorphoses of old ones, as their religious, charitable, and educational tasks were redefined at the dawn of the Counter-Reformation. They played an important role in the emergence of new models of Christian life and morality, especially in Italy, and at the same time in strengthening ecclesiastical structure and curial centralism. The exercise of protectorates was by no means a negligible element of this latter process [2].

The question is much more complex, however, because the function of cardinal protector also extended to the guardianship of states, *nationes*, and Roman national institutions. Morone was involved in this especially with respect to England, as Pole’s successor, and naturally Germany, which had long been at the center of his political and diplomatic activity. Added to all this was his tireless work during the 1560s and 1570s in Rome’s educational institutions, which sheds light on the immense labor he performed with indefatigable energy in the service of the Church. To the end he gave priority to the need - of which he was probably the clearest advocate - to defend the role of the papacy within the living body of a Europe divided by its processes of confessionalization.

The general characteristics, competencies, and functions of early modern cardinal protectorates have only recently been studied in depth by historians [3]. The creation of the office of protector is traced back to Francis of Assisi, who in the rule approved by Honorius III in 1223 obliged the order’s ministers general to ask the pope to appoint a cardinal “who should be governor, protector, and reformer of this congregation” [4]. During the thirteenth century - as the curia and the papacy assumed a central role in structuring religious orders and the Church - the pontiffs began assigning cardinals to supervise the regular clergy, with the ultimate aim of establishing some form of control over their activities. The protectors’ powers remained undefined for a long time, in part to preserve the discretion that enabled them to ensure that clerics of proven papal loyalty were placed at the head of the orders. By virtue of the delegations they held, protectors approved the alienation of property and division into provinces, appointed visitors, redefined jurisdictions, and presided over general chapters. This enabled the chosen cardinal - whose office was held for life - to undertake interventions that were sometimes highly incisive.

With the beginning of the early modern period, popes assigned protectors to virtually all existing and newly created religious orders, with the sole significant exceptions of the Jesuits, whose only protector was Cardinal Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, and the Theatines. In the same period, mediation between the orders and local political authorities - always sensitive to the possible effects of their governmental decisions on the exercise of territorial power - became an important aspect of the protector’s office over the regular clergy, one well reflected in Morone’s activity. Several testimonies agree, moreover, in showing that at least until the 1570s and 1580s secular governments possessed little information about the character and internal activities of the orders [5]. For this reason too, the intermediary role performed by the protector in the

triangular relationship among the Roman curia, the cloisters, and princely courts or republican authorities assumed central importance in the complicated balances established between ecclesiastical and temporal power in early modern Europe. For the same reason the protectorates assigned to individual cardinals multiplied: Scipione Borghese, nephew of Paul V, accumulated about fifty [6]. The appointment of a co-protector - still called a vice-protector in the sixteenth century [7] - became established, especially where the protector needed bureaucratic assistance or where the holder, appointed by a previous pontiff, did not appear fully reliable. The seventeenth century consolidated a practice that had already not been uncommon: granting the protector not only the power to give voting rights in a chapter to monks of his choosing, but also to annul the election of an elected prior general and appoint another at his discretion. This almost unlimited *potestas* gradually diminished, until in the twentieth century the competence of cardinal protectorates was reduced to a merely moral point of reference [8].

It is not easy to understand the criteria by which protectorates were assigned. They were certainly influenced by nepotistic logic and curial alignments, which led factions to clash over the distribution of the growing number of protections over mendicant and monastic orders, states and national ecclesiastical institutions, female and male religious communities, churches and shrines, lay associations, and pious institutions. The choice of protector followed a general practice by which a curial cardinal, who had previously accepted, was designated by name. Curial status was a necessary requirement if the protector was to exercise his role as intermediary between the pope and the institution entrusted to him, and its loss explains the relatively infrequent resignations of which we know [9]. As emerges at moments of transition following the death of a cardinal protector - when clerics, though often dissatisfied with the cardinals' intrusiveness, immediately moved to obtain the appointment of a successor - the protectorate had a dual character: control and mediation. The observations made by the Jesuit Girolamo Piatti in *De cardinalis dignitate et officio*, written in 1591 [10], show that while protectors performed a balancing function between papacy and religious orders, they manipulated to their own advantage internal divisions and conflicts within the orders, as well as competition for governing offices, the granting of privileges and exemptions, and rivalries over the management of economic resources and extensive landed and real-estate holdings. Individual monks or small groups could thus refuse to recognize the legitimacy of rules or procedures imposed by the protector and invoke the pope's direct intervention. Conflicts could also arise between pontiffs and protectors, as happened at the end of the century between Clement VIII and Cardinal Santoro, whose heavy-handed interventions against the Capuchins, of whom he was protector, provoked vigorous protests from the minister general Girolamo da Polizzi [11].

A particularly well-documented instance of Morone's work as protector concerns the Holy House of Loreto, probably the most important ecclesiastical institution protected by a cardinal in the early modern period in terms of the extent of its jurisdiction and the number of persons subject to it [12]. Protectorates over churches or ecclesiastical foundations - usually located in Rome, as in the case of the Sistine and Pauline chapels, the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, and the Companies of the Annunciation and of the Pilgrims - included very broad powers of intervention, including jurisdictional powers, often greater than those normally exercised over religious orders [13]. For this reason, as well as because of the high visibility and prestige they guaranteed, such protectorates aroused keen appetites and consequent conflicts. This duly occurred in the case of the two Loreto offices assumed by Morone.

[2]. The Holy House of Loreto

An intense and widespread Marian spirituality had made the shrine in the Marches one of the most popular pilgrimage destinations of the early sixteenth century, and its devotees included illustrious families such as the d'Avalos. Erasmus himself wrote a liturgy for Our Lady of Loreto [14]. The success of the Lutheran polemic against relics, however, diminished its power of attraction, culminating in the violent invective of Vergerio's pamphlet *De idolo lauretano*, printed in 1554. It argued that the supposed house of Nazareth transported by angels was false, denounced its cult as mere superstition, and condemned the squandering of riches there, which caused cardinals "*inter se litigent et digladientur ut possint a papis illic praefici*" [15]. Pius

IV's subsequent decision, in mid-1564, to entrust protection of the shrine to Morone, recently returned from Trent, formed part of the papal strategy of publicly rehabilitating his friend and fellow Milanese after the conclusion of the inquisitorial proceedings. At the same time, it emphasized Morone's attachment to a traditional devotion that the Jesuits were then also seeking to appropriate, centered on the cult of the Virgin, relics, saints, and their miraculous images, and on faith in the value of pilgrimages, vows, and miracles [16].

After Cardinal Carpi, in his dual capacity as protector of the Holy House and of the Society, summoned the Jesuits to Loreto in 1554, a college of fourteen priests was founded for the edification of clerics, laypeople, and pilgrims, including through preaching and sacramental confession. The shrine's governor, Gaspare Dotti, played a decisive role in installing the Jesuits. He had tried and acquitted Ignatius of Loyola in Venice in 1537, later pronounced his first vows in the Society of Jesus, and was finally dissuaded by Ignatius himself, who was convinced that Dotti was more useful in his Loreto office [17]. It was especially the Jesuit practice of confession, conceived above all as an instrument for the conversion and renewed religious fervor of pilgrims coming from countries in which Lutheranism had penetrated deeply or the Ottoman threat loomed, that multiplied the House's attraction among the popular classes. It transformed the Loreto shrine from a privileged institution of humanists and prelates engaged in Church reform into a kind of internal missionary enclave within the boundaries of Catholicism [18].

Morone's appointment as protector of the Holy House was therefore a strategic element in redefining his self-image as a devout son of the Church and, at the same time, as an icon of the theological and devotional counterattack launched by Rome against the Protestant world. The fact that this otherwise reserved cardinal, fresh from the splendors of Trent, vigorously strove to obtain and retain the coveted protection of the Holy House - and retreated, moreover only partially, after recognizing insurmountable difficulties - makes clear how necessary he considered it, in that unstable historical and personal situation and doubtless also in anticipation of the next conclave, to consolidate that image and associate it ever more closely with his name, using it as a shield should the need arise.

The conflict over assignment of the protectorate was extremely heated and had already begun before Cardinal Carpi's death. On 26 April 1564 Cardinal Gambara wrote from Rome to his colleague Giulio Della Rovere to announce the imminent succession to the Loreto protectorate and guarantee his support with Borromeo. Ten days later Cardinal Cesi, likewise pleading the Urbino cardinal's cause, went to Pius IV, who "answered him rather curtly that he had given it to Morone," as Cesi immediately wrote to Della Rovere. Morone's appointment was made official by an apostolic brief of 10 May, although the Loreto chapter, grateful for the material benefits Della Rovere had secured for the shrine, had already elected the brother of the duke of Urbino [19]. In the eyes of Pope Medici, the aspiration to "govern the House well and holily" - as Morone himself wrote to Della Rovere on 31 May that he wished to do [20] - had a better chance of realization in the Milanese cardinal's hands, since the Urbino cardinal was notoriously devoted to worldly pleasures (Paul IV had rebuked him for his prolonged absence from Rome) 21 and had deserted Trent.

Della Rovere did not give up, however. Through persistent diplomatic action involving his secretary in Rome, Claudio Gonzaga, and Carlo Borromeo himself, he succeeded in making Morone reconsider the decision already expressed "that he could in no way avoid taking possession of Loreto, since the brief had already been issued." Morone's resignation, however, was shrewdly made conditional on first being able to undertake a pilgrimage to Loreto in the pope's company. While awaiting the journey [22], he was thus able to apply himself resolutely to reforming the shrine's government. He finally resigned the office in December through a no less skillful formula of temporary reversion that would allow him, in September 1578, to succeed the deceased Della Rovere in the post and retain it until his own death [23].

The reorganization sketched out by Morone during his first, brief Loreto protectorate was consistent with the pastoral orientations already tested in the dioceses of Modena - of which he resumed possession precisely in 1564 - and Novara. As early as 7 June he wrote to the shrine's chapter announcing the dispatch of his household member Pier Luigi Fedeli, officially to take possession of the protectorate but in practice charged with carrying out a thorough administrative inspection [24]. A man enjoying the cardinal's absolute confidence and already a member of his defense team, Fedeli had in 1563 attempted to obtain from Ghislieri the delivery

of certain inquisitorial documents [25]. In the latter half of the decade Morone would again make use of his collaboration in another protectorate, that of the Fabric of Saint Peter's, which is unfortunately poorly documented [26]. On the basis of the "report on matters requiring attention" prepared by Fedeli, the new protector quickly sent the governor of the House, Loreto Lauri, detailed instructions for governing the institution. The aim was to restore order to worship and administration at the shrine after a long series of scandals and abuses during the final phase of Cardinal Carpi's government, which had also involved the institution's delicate jurisdiction over the exercise of inquisitorial justice.

The measures Morone required in 1564 concerned returning the choir altar "to its former place […] because it is better for the celebrant to face the people than turn his back to them"; the liturgy, with the recommendation that it be celebrated "gracefully," since Loreto possessed the rare privilege of a papal chapel; decoration of the other altars and cleanliness of the chapels, sacristy, and furnishings; offerings for Masses (which were no longer to be pocketed directly by clerics but placed in the appropriate box "by the very persons who give them"); guarding the church, also because of fear of pirates; care of the chapel in which the miraculous building was preserved, and prohibition on melting down small silver ex-votos before the cardinal protector's entry; financial management and a ban on purchasing land (because of the papal will "that the money from the alms of this House be spent on buildings and pious works"); and finally the readiness of the canons to hear confessions, "so that if anyone does not wish to confess to the Jesuits, he may confess to the priests." This last prescription demonstrates that at the shrine the sacrament was considered a competence of the Society.

Morone's lengthy instruction to Lauri then emphasized the need to intervene in the discipline, education, and morals of the clergy. They were advised "to dress honorably and especially to wear garments long enough to touch the ankle" even in public, and not to wear silk clothes, "so that they give no scandal to their neighbor and serve as mirrors of exemplary life to the other priests and pilgrims who come to this holy devotion." The canons were not to linger "in shops chattering with laymen," but to "attend to offices, devotions, and studies." Having learned that various priests were "ignorant both in letters and in singing," the cardinal admonished them to prepare themselves, including through private teachers, for the examination to which the protector would subject them upon taking office. At the same time Morone had the proceedings opened against three canons sent to Rome and ordered that bequests be collected; that no work be done on holy days of obligation; that ministers who proved to be "men of bad life" or harbored outlaws be expelled; that alms be given; that the accounts of the Confraternity of Corpus Christi be inspected; and that the hospital and the sick be kept in good condition. In the severity of these rules one can see not only the grave deterioration in the shrine's material and moral administration, but also one reason for the canons' preference for the more permissive Della Rovere.

The Loreto documentation makes it possible to establish that Morone's prescriptions did not remain on paper. In preparation for the protector's entry, repairs and improvements were made, and work continued on the architectural and artistic program desired by Carpi, approved by the Milanese cardinal, and destined to continue for a long time. When Morone assumed the office, four of the church transept's nine chapels had already been decorated. In addition to those dedicated to the Blessed Sacrament and Saint Anne, the chapel of Saint John the Baptist, with paintings by Pellegrino Tibaldi, and the choir chapel, where seven canvases by Lorenzo Lotto were installed, were completed in 1564. Another significant intervention was the renewal of the shrine's principal governing offices. Shortly before yielding the protectorate to Della Rovere, the cardinal definitively dismissed Governor Gaspare Dotti, citing failure to observe residence as the principal reason for his removal. He also restored to his canonry the treasurer whom Dotti had dismissed several years earlier, and appointed Pompeo Pallantieri - son of Alessandro, governor of Rome and fiscal procurator in the trial of the Carafa - governor in place of the designated Lauri [27].

To understand the significance of the rotations Morone imposed in the shrine's senior offices, it must be borne in mind that Dotti's appointment as governor had initiated a profound transformation of the post, which became a kind of link among Loreto, the Holy Office, and the papal curia. As soon as Carpi, a member of the inquisitorial congregation, assumed the protectorate, he used Dotti as an extraordinary

commissioner of the Holy Office, charged with establishing the tribunal's peripheral seats in the March of Ancona. Dotti had experience in this sphere, having already worked in Venice during the 1530s as a judge of faith in the tribunal presided over by Aleandro, before moving to Rome in Cardinal Carpi's service; at the end of 1551 Carpi had him appointed commissioner of the Holy Office in Loreto [28]. There he soon aroused discontent among the canons and suspicion of financial misconduct, attempting clumsily to repair the shrine's compromised finances and becoming the target of Lorenzo Davidico's insinuations during a cycle of sermons preached at Loreto in 1555 [29].

Dotti's inquisitorial activity was not free of shadows either. Suspicions that he used the justice of faith unscrupulously culminated in 1555-56 in the tragic trials brought against the Marranos of Ancona. Within the framework of Paul IV's ferocious anti-Jewish policy, inaugurated in 1555 by the bull *Cum nimis absurdum*, the pope entrusted the jurist Giovanni Vincenzo Falangonio with scrutinizing the Portuguese presence in the Marches and especially in Ancona, because of the suspicion that they, largely descendants of converted Jews, continued secretly to practice their ancestral religion. After several

weeks of arrests and torture, the pope pursued a twofold initiative: on the one hand, he opened an inquiry into Falangonio's scandalously cavalier administration of justice (Falangonio immediately fled), an investigation that even touched Cardinal Gian Angelo de' Medici, the future Pius IV, who had entered Ancona as governor just as the arrests began; on the other, he asserted the Holy Office's jurisdiction over the trials of the alleged Marranos. They were placed under two new commissioners, one of whom was Dotti, who in 1554 had already performed inquisitorial duties at Ancona in the incumbent's absence. For more than a month he secretly orchestrated "meetings, exchanges of gifts, furtive and ambiguous operations" [30], including dealings with Ottoman emissaries. At their conclusion, twenty-six Portuguese were sent to the stake between April and June 1556, while twenty-seven others - who had agreed to abjure as Judaizers - were sentenced to the galleys for life. All their property was carefully inventoried and confiscated. Yet even before the sentences, and in the face of protests by the Anconitan authorities, who feared for the commercial fortunes of the port, Dotti had been removed as commissioner of the Holy Office. In the spring of 1557 he formally resigned the governorship, though in practice he continued to exercise it even after March 1559, when Cardinal Carpi granted extraordinary inquisitorial powers and the office of governor to Loreto Lauri of Spoleto. The inquiries ordered by the pope into the trials of the Ancona Marranos established that Dotti had acted outside every rule and all oversight [31], finally allowing Morone to remove him from office on 10 November 1564 [32].

Once the dispute with Della Rovere had been settled at the end of that year, the Milanese cardinal maintained sporadic relations with the Holy House. Shortly afterward he commended the Jesuits at Loreto to his successor; and toward the end of 1565, after having a votive plaque installed in the basilica in thanksgiving for a recovery, he made the pilgrimage he had announced, reimbursing the shrine for the expenses incurred during his stay [33]. His coat of arms appears on four other plaques, all datable to the pontificate of Gregory XIII and bearing papal ordinances concerning the shrine, as well as on a cloth-of-gold hanging that he donated [34]. Morone would return to the government of the Holy House in September 1578, when the coveted protectorate of Loreto once again aroused competing ambitions. Among those seeking it was the pope's nephew, Cardinal Filippo Guastavillani, who went on pilgrimage to Loreto as the death of the cardinal of Urbino drew near. This time, however, it was Morone - newly covered in glory after returning from his legations to Genoa and Regensburg - who prevailed in the curia. As soon as he received the appointment, he named a new governor, the Bolognese Vincenzo Casali, and sent him to take possession of the shrine, while Guastavillani had to content himself with the governorship of Ancona, though he would succeed Morone in December 1580.

The Milanese cardinal's second administration of Loreto likewise left a lasting mark. With the assistance of the capable, if excessively cautious, Casali, who immediately set about regularizing the treasury's cash flows [35], Morone strove to restore good government, authority, and jurisdictional independence to the House. To that end he engaged in a fierce conflict with the city of Recanati and with his own nephew, Galeazzo Morone, bishop of Macerata, seeking to free the village of Loreto from both civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction - an emancipation confirmed six years later by Sixtus V. As Morone's family took root in the institutions of the Marches - through Galeazzo's episcopate and the move of Galeazzo's brother Giacomo Antonio to Recanati and Macerata 36 - relations between the Holy House and the Jesuits were strengthened. A brief of Gregory XIII dated 15 December 1579 authorized Morone to withdraw substantial sums from the alms of Loreto, which had increased considerably in recent years, and distribute them among several Jesuit colleges, including the English College, of which he had been appointed protector in May 1579 [37], the Swiss College in Milan, and the college at Olomouc in Bohemia [38]. Shortly before his death, the cardinal further reinforced the Jesuit presence at Loreto by promoting the foundation in 1580 of the Illyrian College for the training of clergy from the Dalmatian dioceses, in response to the persistent concern caused by the Turkish advance in the Balkans. The institute's location beside the shrine - an ancient devotional center for the Slavic populations - strengthened the Holy House's spiritual centrality in the Adriatic world and its continental identity as a Catholic bulwark.

3. Dominicans

The interweaving of personal, reformist, jurisdictional, curial, political-religious, disciplinary, and even inquisitorial concerns evident in the Loreto protectorate can also be seen in Morone's efforts to safeguard several of the leading religious orders. His experience as protector of the Dominicans (1554-80, apart from the interval of his inquisitorial trial, when the office was not coincidentally entrusted to Ghislieri) [39], the Cassinese Benedictines (1555-80, with the Theatine Bernardino Scotti replacing him during the same interval), and the Cistercians (1560-80), together with other protectorates about which the evidence is more fragmentary, reveals further aspects of the cardinal's response to the great political and religious transformations of his age. It is well known that in the Europe of the first half of the sixteenth century the image of the regular orders had sharply deteriorated. Alongside the abuses and shortcomings already discussed, the criticisms of Erasmus and other humanists, who regarded the influence of monks and friars as pernicious because they fed popular religion with devotional practices as empty as they were profitable, as well as Luther's attacks on claims that the monastic ideal was superior to the ordinary life of the faithful, had caused cloisters and pulpits to lose prestige and often become targets of savage satire [40]. At the same time, because they were more mobile, the preachers of the mendicant orders had been one of the principal channels through which heterodox ideas spread; this was another reason why the Council of Trent had tried to curb their monopoly of the pulpit by strengthening the oversight of diocesan ordinaries.

The final phase of Trent had attempted to address the thorny question of the clergy's moral reform, without, however, allowing the position of those who - like Morone - considered it necessary to entrust the care of souls exclusively to bishops and parish priests to prevail. Like all the reform decrees that the legate secured during the last weeks of his presidency at the end of 1563, the decree on regulars represented a compromise between the curia's program and the bishops' wishes. The effort to strengthen episcopal authority over exempt orders came to nothing, partly because of the massive presence of influential representatives of those orders and partly because the curia wished to retain control over them. Nothing was decided, for example, about the number of monasteries, the consolidation and refoundation of Benedictine houses, the abolition of the Conventuals, or the use of the orders' property for new pastoral tasks [41].

Monastic and conventual spirituality and education had not entirely lost their appeal, however: on the one hand because episcopal seminaries were established only with extreme slowness, leaving the training of the secular clergy persistently inadequate [42]; on the other because the late-medieval impulse toward "observance" endured, especially among Augustinians, Benedictines, Franciscans, and Dominicans, with its awareness of the need for personal and institutional renewal inspired by a desire to return to the original spirit of vows and rules [43]. For this reason too, during the decades in which Morone held the protectorates of several of the most important religious orders, they retained a dense presence throughout the Italian peninsula and consolidated their character as genuinely autonomous material and cultural microcosms. The social penetration and numerical extent of monasteries and convents in early-sixteenth-century Italy remained strong, despite periodic papal attempts to enforce a minimum number of religious in each community so as to curb the proliferation of tiny convents. In the major cities, male and female monastic and conventual institutions numbered a hundred or more. Many churches still depended on convents, and the regular clergy monopolized preaching, especially during the great cycles of Advent and Lent, while capturing a large share of popular devotion. As Pius V and Gregory XIII applied the Tridentine canons by imposing enclosure on women's communities, male communities assumed a large part of the parochial burden [44].

In response to the development of new religious formations and the emergence of new spiritual needs in Church and society, Rome also intervened to consolidate papal control over the orders. The Italianization of the vicariate during the transition to a new abbot, president, or master general; the creation of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars; the introduction of papal confirmation for the newly elected superior; and the almost universal appointment of cardinal protectors were the principal measures adopted for this purpose, alongside the promulgation of bulls of reform and comprehensive reorganization. Though not always entirely coherent or effective, this integrated policy made the cardinal protectorates a crucial link between the religious orders and the papal curia. Yet it always operated within the dual structure in which, as

already noted, this kind of office must be understood: a form of government parallel to that of superiors, visitors, and chapters, intended both to mediate between the interests of the religious and Rome and to secure curial control over the leadership of the orders [45]. Relations between the orders and their protectors could be extremely turbulent, as shown by the shot fired at Carlo Borromeo by the Milanese Humiliati in 1569; two years later, at Pius V's behest, the order was suppressed [46]. Such conflicts often arose from protectors' attempts to remedy moral laxity, failures of observance, and the frustrating ineffectiveness of general chapters - attempts sometimes nullified by the blanket of indifference and vested interests that covered conduct inconsistent with the conciliar decrees, which in many cloisters had fallen virtually without effect. As a growing body of scholarship has shown, this laxity was not an emergency but a constant across long stretches of the history of the regular orders, erupting only occasionally in spectacular scandals before sinking back into anonymous routine [47].

As Jedin observed, Morone was not among the cardinal protectors who most actively promoted reform of their orders, especially when compared with Cervini among the Servites and Maffei among the Carmelites [48]. Yet the overall logic of his intervention at Loreto - at once one element in the rehabilitation of his public image, an instrument of Roman supremacy, an embryonic testing ground for a reformist vision of pastoral government, and a strategic component of the Catholic counteroffensive against Protestantism and Islam - can also be discerned in his protection of the Dominicans. The prestigious guardianship of the Friars Preachers had been assigned to Morone under Julius III 49 and was confirmed by Pius IV after his acquittal in 1560, just as long-standing tensions in the relationship between Rome and the order were coming to a head. On both occasions, in 1553 and 1560, the Inquisition had tried to obstruct the popes' decisions.

The Reformation had wiped out no fewer than eight provinces, fifty male convents, and forty female convents in Germany. After the end of the brief Catholic restoration in England, the province across the Channel - which had comprised fifty-three houses and about [1],200 friars - was definitively abolished as well. From Clement VII onward, the popes had in some measure profited from the weakening of the powerful Order of Preachers, using it as an opportunity to consolidate control over a religious body proud of its autonomy from Rome. Within this framework, Morone's exercise of the protectorate coincided with the long generalate of Vincenzo Giustiniani (1558-71), who from his first circular letter had condemned the decline of the order and its discipline, merged the remnants of the Bohemian and Hungarian provinces into the Austrian province, and reaffirmed the obligation to observe the rule, live in poverty, and establish at least one observant convent in every province [50]. Giustiniani's attempt in the early 1560s to visit the French convents and introduce observance there was obstructed by the crown - which in Paris barred him from Saint-Jacques - and by the political and religious turbulence of the nascent civil wars. Morone was kept closely informed of the outcome of the mission beyond the Alps through letters such as the one sent from Avignon on 12 April 1561. After reporting his "first entry into France," Giustiniani described the broad regions of southern France that were slipping from the monarchy's grasp: "I have not come this far, nor shall I go farther, without continual dangers, especially since I pass no convent without the required visitation." He would nevertheless try to follow Morone's "holy and good counsels," "visiting about twenty convents even though they are in places of greater danger." "It is true, however," he concluded with relief, "that I have not found matters in the ruinous condition I had heard of in Italy; but I do say that they are heading in such a direction that within a few years, unless God prevents it, they will fall into calamity" [51].

The protector's and the general's concerns about the moral conduct and government of the order are reflected in the many proposals for "reformation" that reached Morone's desk, including a memorandum "to bring some order" to the province of the preachers in the Kingdom of Naples;

a *Declaratio christianae reformationis religiosorum utriusque sexus*; and a plan for the "reformation" of the province of Amalfi [52]. The most alarming situation appeared to be that in the Kingdom of Naples, where the Savonarolan Paolino Bernardini moved. A learned theologian, Bernardini had saved Savonarola's works from condemnation by the Index in 1558 with a speech before the cardinals of the Holy Office, before abandoning scholarship to work for the restoration of observance [53]. But discouraging reports also reached Morone from elsewhere. On 28 October 1556, for example, the Elders of Reggio Emilia informed him of the

“countless scandals to the whole people” caused by observant Dominicans through their misconduct with the nuns of two convents, who had become “very wanton and licentious,” taking advantage of certain “confessionals” that had become “places for recreation, conversation, and amusement.” In response to the friars’ protests - the Elders claimed that they had been “made so blind by their carnal desires” that they induced the nuns to break enclosure “under the pretext of confession” and spend “six or seven hours” in the male convent - the city authorities “expelled all those friars from the convent and from the city, though without any injury to their persons or property, or to the goods of the monastery, which is being kept and well guarded by persons of the utmost integrity” [54].

The situation in the Roman province was no better, as shown by a lengthy report on its “principal disorders” commissioned by Morone in 1579. It emphasized the familiar failure to restore “original observance,” something the author judged “humanly speaking, impossible,” “not so much because the material is indisposed as because of the scarcity and weakness of the agents who in our times must move and stir so corrupt a mass.” The reforms devised at Trent and the decisions of subsequent chapters had not affected “the impunity” enjoyed by most friars, which had “thus far caused very great harm to the province,” whereas “punishing those who deserve it would put some sense into many heads.” “The lack of unity among both prelates and subjects” was regarded as “the gravest and principal wound” of the Roman province. The report expressed the hope that the next provincial would “keep a tight rein in his hand” and bring under his authority those who were “pernicious and harmful to good living and to the community.” At the same time it lamented the enormous work still needed to improve the formation of novices and the “great negligence” with which lay brothers were educated, since “more often than not they turn out irreverent, uncivil, and wholly without manners” [55]. The contemporary situation in the Tuscan province was not very different; another “information” sent to Morone described it as a body “traveling on the worst possible road” [56].

The Council of Trent had tried to limit Dominican privileges, and at the general chapter held at Bologna in 1564 Giustiniani, who had taken part in the council, sought to begin reform in the very city that preserved the founder’s relics. From there he corresponded with Morone. Although only a few traces of their exchange survive, they show that the cardinal followed the chapter closely. In a letter of May 1564 Giustiniani informed him that he had reached Bologna and “found various letters and orders from Your Most Illustrious Lordship, all of which I shall carry out with complete fidelity and sincerity.” He stressed the difficulty of providing for the convents of Cyprus: “I see it as a desperate undertaking, and if I wish to persuade these fathers of Lombardy to assist me in reforming those convents . . . it will be impossible for them to undertake so distant an enterprise” [57]. The problems of the convents on the Venetian island, constantly threatened by the Turk, were of particular concern to Morone. In February 1561 Pius IV had appointed him, alongside Cardinal Michele Ghislieri, protector of Gabriel VII, the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria, and of the Ethiopian church of Santo Stefano in the Vatican [58]. In those years the Holy See was in fact seeking to use the Dominicans and the Ethiopian community of Cyprus in a policy designed to contain Orthodox and Muslim pressure in the East [59].

In 1566 Giustiniani published the order’s new constitutions, which established strict control by the general over every activity of the religious, though he was well aware how difficult it was to impose change by authority in so compromised a situation. At the end of the previous year an old acquaintance of Morone’s, Fra Reginaldo Nerli, had written from the province of Bologna to denounce the fact that the decisions of the most recent general chapter had remained unimplemented and that conditions had deteriorated still further [60]. Shortly afterward the election of the Dominican Michele Ghislieri to the papacy heralded the restoration of the mendicants’ privileges, confirmed by the bull *Etsi mendicantium ordinum* of May 1567. The previous year the cardinal had received a letter from the convent of Palermo expressing sorrow at the news that he had entered the conclave in poor health and joy on learning that he had emerged recovered and that the new pope had entrusted to him “the protection of his Dominican order,” in the certainty that this arose from “the true and sincere love that His Holiness bears Your Lordship” [61].

The general chapter held in Rome in 1569 in the presence of Pius V himself confirmed Giustiniani at the head of the order, in whose convents the widespread persistence of conduct contrary to the rule continued to

be denounced [62]. Although the pope supported his reforming action, Giustiniani's continued tenure as general delayed his elevation to the cardinalate, because Pius V believed that granting him the purple would make it necessary to do the same for the heads of the other major religious orders. Only after he completed a diplomatic mission to Spain at the end of 1569 - intended in part to settle the Milanese jurisdictional controversies dividing Borromeo, the Senate, and the local governor - did the pope finally grant Giustiniani the red hat. On 6 July 1570, from Madrid, Giustiniani replied to Morone's congratulations [63]. He was succeeded by Serafino Cavalli, who, as a leading figure at the chapters of 1574 and 1578, once again called the order back to observance of the Tridentine canons while confronting the effects of Gregory XIII's more restrictive policy toward the privileges restored by his predecessor. The papers preserved by Morone show that during those years, in his capacity as protector, he responded to the spiritual needs of members of the nobility and higher clergy by putting them in contact with friars of the order. In 1564, for example, he asked Giustiniani "to give Father Fra Benedetto of Mantua as theologian to the Most Illustrious Monsignor [Francesco] Gonzaga" - merely a namesake of Fontanini - but Giustiniani had already assigned him another task [64].

To carry out some of the duties associated with his protectorates, the cardinal relied on trusted collaborators who could also serve as links among the various offices. Alongside Pier Luigi Fedeli, one may cite the Perugian nobleman Vincenzo Ercolani, a Savonarolan, who in 1562 joined Morone on the papal commission "for the business of printing," charged with an ambitious publishing program. Among other things, it provided for new and more reliable editions of foundational patristic texts, to be printed in Rome by Paolo Manuzio [65]. Morone assigned Ercolani, formerly prior of the Minerva and later head of the Roman province, the task of reviewing several manuscripts of Bernard of Clairvaux [66], before employing him in the broader reform of the Cistercians, whose "laxity" gave rise to concerns in some respects analogous to those caused by the Friars Preachers.

4. Cistercians

The office of protector of the Congregation of Saint Bernard - vacant since the death of Girolamo Capodiferro in December 1559 - was assigned to Morone by Pius IV on 15 July 1560 [67]. His first success, already in the summer of that year, was to reconcile Benedictine superiors with apostate monks whom he judged repentant. They could thereby avoid the penalties imposed by the order's constitutions, which included permanent deprivation of active and passive voice. On that occasion the papal delegation also extended to the reinstatement of repentant apostate monks in the Congregation of the Hermits of Saint Jerome, likewise under Morone's protection; Julius III had entrusted him with reforming that order in 1552 [68]. This first moderating intervention can be interpreted as an explicit political stance by Pius IV and Morone in sharp opposition to the severe persecution of apostates imposed by Paul IV two years earlier [69]. From that point until his death the cardinal devoted himself intensely to the Cistercian protectorate, which entailed regular consultation with the order's transalpine leadership and agreement with the French crown. Although accused of anti-French sentiment - in 1574 the procurator general Nicolas Boucherat wrote, for example, to the cardinal of Lorraine that Morone was in many cases a good protector, but that when monasteries in his Lombard homeland were involved he was rather cool, being anything but pro-French 70 - the cardinal dealt intelligently both with the crown and with Louis de Baissey, abbot of Cîteaux from 1560 to 1564.

The patronage of religious orders also entailed delicate political relations with the rulers of the states in which they were established, as can be seen from the draft of a letter that Morone wrote to Catherine de' Medici as protector of the Cistercians. The occasion arose after the death in July 1564 of the aforementioned abbot of Cîteaux, Louis de Baissey, which opened a bitter dispute over the election of his successor. Under his mother's influence, and contrary to the concordats in force with the Apostolic See, the young king Charles IX of France attempted to impose his own candidate by deposing Souchier, who had recently returned from Trent and had been duly elected by the monks [71]. In this thorny situation the protector had to contact Henry II's widow for the first time and request her intervention as a personal favor. With its tangle of deletions, the draft of Morone's anguished letter visually conveys the difficulty he experienced in composing

it [72]. His request that the queen mother reduce the fiscal burden on the monasteries and not “take away the hope of commendams” - described as “a great aid to Your Majesties’ holy purposes for the proper restoration of that kingdom, and a holy example to other states in the service of God” - was likewise presented as a personal favor: “That religious order and I, its protector, shall remain eternally indebted to Your Majesties” [73]. The protector’s intervention, also urged by the cardinal of Lorraine [74], was naturally appreciated by Souchier, who thanked him for “the care and kind affection with which you deign to support my election to the abbey of Cîteaux and to impede those who, against all reason, seek to obtain it” [75].

The problem would recur a few years later. In 1571, after the death of Souchier - by then created cardinal by Ghislieri - the monks elected Nicolas Boucherat to succeed him at Cîteaux and Lupin Le Myre at Clairvaux. Pius V confirmed both at the beginning of the following year, while Charles IX once again asserted royal prerogatives in the matter [76]. Boucherat, whom Morone had met during the Frenchman’s visitation of Cistercian abbeys in central and southern Italy in the 1560s [77], ultimately prevailed. During the following decade he remained in constant contact with Morone, though he never fully trusted him, continuing to monitor conditions in the Italian abbeys, visiting those in Germany, and reviving the life of the order in Poland, where the protector - as he wrote to the general in 1579 - ardently desired that energetic reformers be sent [78].

Although informed of the desperate condition of the Italian monasteries and of the protector’s desire to undertake a reform of the order, Louis de Baissey reacted coolly to Morone’s reforming appeals. This allowed Morone to strengthen the relationship between the Bernardine congregation and the Roman curia along a strategic line that became the distinctive feature of the Cistercian *reformatio*, without compromising - thanks to the skillful balance with which it was pursued - the ties between the Congregation of Saint Bernard in Italy and its French superiors.

The starting point of this policy was the Roman monasteries of San Saba on the Aventine and Santi Vincenzo e Anastasio, whose priors also served as curial procurators for the affairs of the Lombard and Tuscan provinces. In March 1562 Pius IV granted the protector the transfer of San Saba to the cardinalatial basilica of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, thereby raising the dignity of the Lombard protector general from prior to abbot and increasing both the number and the quality of his monks [79]. A temporary disagreement between Italians and Frenchmen threatened to compromise Morone’s project, so he shifted the center of negotiation to Trent. The general resided there from November 1562 to December 1563, and his talks with the protector, in which two other Cistercians sent by the general chapter participated - Jérôme Souchier and the aforementioned Boucherat, both future abbots of Cîteaux - established the reforming program to be undertaken after the council [80]. The pro-papal positions adopted by the Cistercians at Trent made clear the transalpines’ desire to bind themselves ever more closely to Rome and retain exemption from local episcopal authority, in part as a means of restoring Bernardine authority and prestige beyond France. In that same year, 1563, Baissey went to Rome to obtain new privileges from Pius IV that would help him contain the separatism of the Spanish Cistercians, while at the same time seeking approval for the agreements between the procurators general of Lombardy and Tuscany dating from 1513 but never implemented.

Their ratification by the pope, confirmed by the general chapter of Cîteaux in 1565, finally secured formal legal status for the Italian Cistercians and thus strengthened the authority of the provincial superiors. These developments reinforced not only the Tridentine spirit of restoring hierarchies but, more broadly, Rome’s determination to define the legal position of the regular orders and stabilize their structures of government, partly independently of the power of chapters [81].

At the conclusion of this persistent effort, in 1574 Morone obtained a brief from Gregory XIII that addressed the unity of the Bernardine congregation in a systematic way, establishing a six-person governing body for each province and confirming the preeminent role of the abbey of Chiaravalle Milanese. From that year the abbey was governed by Giovenale Oraboni, who corresponded with both the protector and Borromeo in pursuit of this result. Finally, the lengthy bull *Romanus pontifex* of May 1579, likewise issued at Morone’s request, laid the foundations for the *reformatio* of the Italian Cistercians through substantial innovations: lengthening the intervals between chapters, with the aim of strengthening peripheral

government; rationalizing the procedures for visiting monasteries; and assigning the definitors of the following chapter the task of approving, for each province, the ratio between priests and abbots, while also setting precise qualifications for the selection of monastic superiors [82]. The protector's tireless commitment to reform earned him broad support within the order. In 1578, for example, after the continuing plague in Lombardy prevented the celebration of a chapter and led to the convocation of two separate assemblies - with the Tuscan chapter reluctantly submitting to the president imposed by the cardinal protector - Stefano Aliprandi, a Ferrarese monk long engaged in the care of souls in the parish adjoining the abbey of Morimondo, wrote to lament the order's difficult condition. He described it as "this poor and storm-tossed little boat, which for many years has threatened to sink . . . once a pillar of holy mother Church," but which thanks to Morone and Alessandro Farnese was undergoing a profound renewal [83].

By the mid-sixteenth century, the physical deterioration of monastic buildings had become a significant problem for the Bernardine order. It was the product of a distinctive cultural history based on an economy derived from the rule and on rural building techniques. From the Middle Ages onward, Cistercian complexes had often been erected by the monks themselves according to principles of functional simplicity and an absence of sculptural decoration, with the result that they were frequently in precarious condition - also because of fifteenth-century earthquakes - and aesthetically inadequate. A visitation report on the Cistercian monasteries in the Kingdom of Naples drawn up for Morone in 1569 [84], for example, described the church of the abbey of Fossanova as "poorly supplied, with very few decorations and vestments necessary for the celebration of sacred rites." The roof was ruined and let in the rain; the cloister was collapsing; the chapter house was intact but had no glass in its windows and was exposed to cold and wind; and several altars - including the one dedicated to Saint Thomas - were without roofs and close to ruin. The monastery of Santa Maria di Ponza was in a similar condition, wholly unprotected from the weather and lacking sacred images apart from a crucifix, Saint John, and the Magdalene, "painted on the wall without any ornament": a house deserted by people and ceremonies, where perhaps one Mass a week was said. "All the altars are in ruins" at the monastery of Santa Maria di Realvalle as well, while at Santa Maria di Corazzo in Calabria six monks lived "without many things necessary for food and clothing," and even the tabernacle was missing. Where repairs were under way, as at Santa Maria del Sagittario in the Potenza area, liturgical duties impeded the work.

This alarming report offered an effective summary of the disciplinary and moral problems of the *ordo cisterciensis*, though it also contained some encouraging signs. Among them was the account sent to Morone in June 1564 by Baissey, then conducting a systematic visitation of the Italian monasteries intended to implant the spirit of the Tridentine decrees among the regular clergy [85]. "In the visitation I have made," wrote the abbot, now close to death, "I say with great joy that I have found divine worship and the divine office well attended in every monastery, according, of course, to the greater or smaller number of persons residing there" [86]. Not all the reports reaching Morone were equally reassuring, however. This led him to intervene in 1566-67 through Vincenzo Ercolani, who moved to Florence to visit and reform the monasteries of San Salvatore at Settimo Fiorentino, Santa Maria Maddalena di Cistello Fiorentino, and San Bartolomeo di Buonsollazzo, and to supervise observance of the rule and monastic discipline, with powers that included the imprisonment of rebellious monks. His letters vividly describe the gravity of the religious, moral, and financial crisis in those communities, which with Morone's approval he united to the Cistercian Congregation of Santa Giustina [87]. Yet even in 1570 the information reaching the protector from Florence remained deeply disappointing. A commissioner whom he sent warned that "unless some decision is taken, the abbey of Settimo must inevitably collapse and be uprooted to its foundations." He emphasized the monks' constant complaints about "the miserable life they led and the loss of credit they suffered throughout the city" because of "the bad administration of the one who holds the place of abbot and prior . . . creating turmoil in spiritual as well as temporal matters through various complaints and denunciations, making such a noise that it was heard even among the laity, and I think it was heard even in Rome." Expenditure exceeded income by more than [2],000 scudi a year, creating the danger "that this abbey will soon be reduced to nothing," since "it is in debt on every side and to many persons" [88].

5. Cassinese Benedictines

No less burdensome and delicate were the problems that the Milanese cardinal had to confront as protector of the Cassinese Congregation, especially in light of the inquisitorial trials directed against the many followers within the order of the heresiarch Giorgio Siculo [89]. The congregation had arisen from the reform begun in the early fifteenth century by the abbey of Santa Giustina in Padua, with the aim of restoring primitive observance and giving monks mobility and time for study, especially of the Greek Fathers. During the sixteenth-century religious crisis it had produced figures such as Gregorio Cortese and Benedetto Fontanini of Mantua, author of the first draft of the *Benefit of Christ*, and had been placed under the protection of cardinals of great cultural stature such as Contarini (from 1539), Bembo (from 1542), and Pole (from 1547). This succession - including Morone's replacement of the English cardinal in 1555 - has suggested the existence of a kind of "evangelical line" in the Cassinese protectorate [90]. Siculo composed a text on justification that he wished to transmit to the English cardinal, then at Trent as papal legate, entrusting to him as well the mysteries of a revelation made to him by Christ himself. Morone's appointment, which came as the inquisitors were investigating Cassinese monasteries in order to hunt down the followers of the Sicilian heresiarch [91], would be made still more awkward by his own status as an accused man under Paul IV and Pius V. In 1558, and again ten years later, those popes established and confirmed the congregation's privilege of choosing internal commissioners to investigate reading and religious discussion, thereby exempting it from episcopal jurisdiction [92].

After the severe purge imposed by the inquisitors, the intellectually maimed congregation had to conform to Tridentine directives. One need only glance through the enormous mass of reform proposals sent to the cardinal protector during the periods of most intense debate over revision of the Benedictine rule 93 to understand how strongly the monasteries felt the need for radical change capable of remedying the most scandalous abuses. Morone's long experience made him aware that written rules alone could not straighten every crooked practice. This is shown by a letter addressed to him by the abbot of San Pietro di Gessate on 10 February 1578, who recalled having often heard Morone say "that our religious order had a good and holy rule and constitutions, which, if observed, were sufficient not only to preserve and sustain a religious order but even to govern a state" [94]. Nor had the conciliar decrees yet produced any results, as the Cassinese abbot of Parma bitterly observed in a letter to him dated 10 December 1577. He recalled how Morone's own work at Trent had inspired hope for the reform of the order. Yet despite his urging, it was only in 1568 that "by public decree reformers began to be appointed to repair the printed ordinances," and only ten years later that they had managed to give birth to "our reform . . . exactly like an elephant, which they say remains so long in its mother's womb" [95].

After the devastation inflicted by the Holy Office, only a radical moral and spiritual renewal, individual and collective, could offer some hope of remedying the flood of small and great dramas whose reports reached the protector every day. The situation at Perugia was tragicomic. Whenever the monks left "the house for their recreation," the bell of the neighboring female convent of Santa Caterina, subject to the Cassinese abbot, would ring, and at once "a crowd of a hundred nuns appeared on the roofs, along the walls, and at the windows . . . and here the laypeople passing by behold a spectacle truly ridiculous and scandalous" [96]. Different in tone but equally discouraging was the reasoned protest of the "men and communities of Sant'Elia, Santo Vittore, San Panaro," and other places under the jurisdiction of the abbey of Montecassino - the protector's "little sheep," no longer able "to withstand the burdens and unlawful oppressions." They complained that they had not been visited for three years, though they still had to pay the monastery the equivalent of the meals due during visitations; that they had not received confirmation for at least twelve years; that they had to pay the abbey four giulii for every deceased person, even though, they claimed, the monks did not come to officiate; and that they faced a long list of dues and tithes they considered illegitimate. According to the monastery's "vassals," the monks also demanded "one ham for every pig slaughtered in the house" and had ceased to distribute alms. Finally, they observed that "no seminary has been created in the said place, nor any beginning made toward one, contrary to the decrees of the holy council" 97 - evidence of the first roots of popular attention to Tridentine prescriptions.

A concern common to Morone's various protectorates was supervision of the administration of internal justice in monasteries and convents, which has left several traces in his correspondence with the leaders of the orders and with other cardinal protectors [98]. To remain with the Cassinese congregation, a brief look at the case brought under Pius V against Don Paolo Brandino illuminates the disturbing mixture of laxity, defiance of authority, and personal animosity produced in some measure by the spiritual tensions and repression that had troubled the congregation in the preceding decades. "Don Paolo Brandino made difficulty about allowing himself to be examined and swearing to tell the truth unless he first knew what he was to be examined about, saying that he had no duty to obey Cardinal Morone, who had nothing to do with him even though he was protector." Thus began a memorandum on the misdeeds attributed to the religious [99]. His confession revealed that he had come to Rome without permission, "climbing twice over a broken wall . . . because [he says that] he has no superior other than the pope." He was also accused of handling money, justifying himself by saying that "all the friars have money, even though the rule does not permit it, and every year at chapter they are told that whoever has money must declare it and that whoever fails to do so would be excommunicated, but if it is acquired afterward he has never seen anyone punished for it." He was also accused of statements bordering on heterodoxy:

> Don Zaccaria told him that in every case any individual confessor could absolve just as much as the pope, since each consecrates equally; . . . and he told him this several times together with other Lutheran things, and he never revealed it until some months after he had been wounded by the same Don Zaccaria; and then, he says, he informed the fathers of this and many other things, and he had not reported it because he had never heard any proclamation against heresy or any threat of punishment against those who knew of heretics and did not reveal them.

Don Paolo then insisted "that the canonical form must be observed with him in proceeding and judging, because the friars' form is the devil's form," exclaiming, "By the whore of Antichrist!" He confessed to having stirred up disputes in various monasteries where he had lived, including Venice and Pavia, where he forced a confrere to eat some candles that the man had tried to steal from him after Don Paolo won them at chess. He had been wounded in the head "with a large knife" by the same Don Zaccaria and had called a monk who later became prior of Ragusa a "beast." He had repeatedly broken the silence imposed on him, insulted Don Sisto of Bologna by saying, "I was not flogged for being a sodomite, as you were," and incited one confrere to testify against another who "had dealings with a woman beneath the altar, promising him money."

He had written "that the abbot was an unbeliever in the life to come" and admitted that "he was a little merry" when "beside the fire he raised his clothes to warm his feet, and at that time he wore no breeches, though he says he wears them in winter," and that "speaking of the vice of sodomy he said, 'I am of the trade.'" We do not know how Morone decided to conclude this case, which the defendant insisted on having tried in the curia. Yet after his experience during the nunciature in Venice, Alberto Bolognetti acknowledged that Morone had always collaborated in the practical management of problems, even at the cost of occasional friction with the general of the order [100].

The office of protector of religious orders also enabled cardinals to plan and carry out more edifying interventions. For Morone these included cultural initiatives connected with the renewed political and theological needs of the post-Tridentine papacy, which sought precedents and arguments in support of its primacy and cultivated a class of scholars capable of conceiving and completing major publishing enterprises. Cesare Baronio's *Annales ecclesiastici*, which among other things provoked conflict with the king of Spain when they challenged certain royal prerogatives in ecclesiastical matters, exemplify the "market for intellectuals" fostered by the papal curia from the second half of the sixteenth century, a market that sustained the ambitious attempt to construct a Tridentine Europe [101]. The recruitment of regular clergy through patronage networks, gifts, favors, and protections granted in part by cardinal protectors was an essential component of that project. It benefited greatly from the schools and conventual libraries in which a large part of the Counter-Reformation clergy was trained, in contrast with the inadequacy of the few diocesan seminaries then in existence [102].

Already in the first half of 1562 Morone had approached Abbot Teofilo Appiani, president of the order and former superior of the Milanese abbey of Chiaravalle, to involve the Italian Cistercians in the great philological enterprise of "elucidating," as Appiani wrote to the protector, "the works of the glorious Saint Jerome, badly treated by Erasmus's depraved doctrine." Erasmus had edited the monumental nine-volume edition published at Basel in 1516 [103]. At the same time the Cassinese monks of Mantua confirmed that they intended to carry out Morone's order "to compare the ancient works of Saint Jerome with the modern editions" and to send to Rome inventories "of all the ancient Greek and Latin books, both manuscript and printed, that they find in the monasteries" [104]. The task was later entrusted to Mariano Vittori, formerly a member of Pole's household and then of Morone's, in whose Trastevere palace he resided. The cardinal also set the Cassinese monks to work supplying authoritative manuscripts. In 1564-65 three volumes of *Epistulae* were printed containing more than [1],500 emendations to Erasmus's text; the dedication to Pope Medici paid tribute to the protector for promoting the undertaking [105]. From 1569 Morone was also a member of the commission charged with producing a corrected edition of the Vulgate, and it was probably he who encouraged the collation of the Latin text in the monasteries of Florence and Montecassino as part of the research into Jerome's text that he had promoted years earlier, when he had already planned a new edition of the Vulgate to be entrusted to Vittori [106].

There are also indications that other cardinals 107 and individual monks approached Morone directly to request that he promote or support scholarly research amid a thousand philological and material difficulties [108]. Yet in the climate of suspicion, if not open repression, created by the Roman Inquisition and the growing practice of indexes of prohibited books, such activity could prove dangerous for a protector who, like Morone, was a former defendant. At Trent, for example, he received a letter from Ghislieri dated 26 June 1563 informing him that Giovanni Carlo Bovio, archbishop of Ostuni - "a learned and worthy prelate, but a man who may have erred" - had printed at Venice his translation from Greek of the Pseudo-Clementine *De constitutionibus apostolicis*, "with a dedicatory epistle to Your Most Illustrious and Reverend Lordship and to your most illustrious and reverend colleagues [the legates]" [109]. The inquisitor's warnings about Bovio - who at Trent was defending the crucial importance of episcopal residence for an authentic reform of the Church - and consequently about the book's dedicatees assumed a tone that might be called courteously threatening. "The title disturbed me," the future Pius V began, "because it did not seem to me that these times called for the discovery of a new canonical scripture which the Church has never regarded as such, when those who are weakly grounded in faith scarcely wish to accept even those scriptures that the Church has received as canonical." He informed Morone that he had had the book examined by "certain good and religious theologians, who have extracted for me the errors noted in the enclosed sheet," which he was sending "so that you may take steps to prevent this work from being further disseminated, since it might give the simple occasion to err."

Another publishing venture that proved dangerous for Morone was prepared by the Milanese Cassinese monk Ambrogio Ferrari, abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice. Ferrari produced a translation dedicated to Morone of two works by Cyril of Alexandria, the *Glaphyra* on Genesis and the *De adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate*, which around 1566 he sought to have printed by Gaspare Bindoni. The cardinal was probably the first to rejoice that the enterprise failed, since shortly afterward the abbot was condemned by the Inquisition and forced to abjure in Rome [110]. Somewhat connected with the Cassinese milieu was the 1573 edition of the collected Latin and Greek letters of the Benedictine cardinal Gregorio Cortese, who had taught theology to Benedetto Fontanini and Giorgio Siculo and had collaborated with Morone at Modena during the confrontation with the academicians in 1542 [111]. The volume, published at the initiative of Cortese's niece Ersilia Cortese Del Monte, also contained a polemical defense of papal supremacy, the *Tractatus adversus negantem Petrum apostolum Romae fuisse* [112]. Morone also deserves credit for supporting the Veronese Augustinian hermit Onofrio Panvinio's continuation of Platina's *Historia de vitis pontificum* [113]. He commended Panvinio to Philip II as one of the many men "who labor for the benefit of our Christian religion" and whom the Catholic king customarily took under his protection. "I have no doubt," he continued, "that Father Fra Onofrio, who . . . has continued and completed an ecclesiastical history against certain pernicious writings of modern heretics, will receive honorable assistance" [114]. In fact, in the edition

published in 1562 under Pius IV, Panvinio had voiced very severe criticisms - in defense of Morone and Pole - of Paul IV's inquisitorial policy. These were softened in the subsequent edition, printed at Cologne in 1568 with a dedication to Pius V [115].

Finally, we know too little about Morone's other protectorates. These included the Humiliati of Milan and Pavia [116], entrusted to him by Paul III in 1548 after the death of Cardinal Agostino Trivulzio, an office he retained until 1560, when Pius IV assigned it to Borromeo [117]; and several powerful Roman confraternities whose protectorates he assumed in the early 1550s, including, from 1553 until his death, San Girolamo, better known as the Charity. The Dominican Tommaso Stella later boasted that he had suggested Morone's appointment as cardinal protector not only of that "most celebrated company and cause of very many pious works," but also of the confraternity "of the Most Holy Sacrament at the Minerva" [118]. Many witnesses in the defensive trial held at Rome in 1560 recalled Morone's generosity in distributing alms in the name of the Charity, at times paying from his own purse to assist "many families of the respectable poor" who were not on the list of those "receiving alms from the Company" [119]. In his own defensive *articuli* he recalled having been its protector and, as such, superintendent of the many charitable works promoted by the confraternity [120]. Yet it should be remembered that beyond pious works and almsgiving, Julius III also charged the confraternity with monitoring and suppressing fraud against prisoners, effectively entrusting it with oversight of Rome's prisons [121]. Morone was also protector of the hospice for converted prostitutes and of the hospital of Santo Spirito in Sassia, which he helped "by procuring money for it" [122], and later of the hospital of Sant'Ambrogio, to which he left 100 scudi in his will. He assigned 200 scudi to the Charity, the same amount to the Convertite, and 300 to the confraternity of the Orphans [123], to which "he gave eight or ten scudi each month from his own purse" [124].

6. "In Memory of the Most Illustrious Cardinal Pole": The Protectorate of England

In exercising protectorates, cardinals interacted with princes and secular governments, mobilizing material and informal resources and framing their interventions within a precise language and rhetoric of patronage [125]. Whether exercised on behalf of religious orders, ecclesiastical institutions, or states, a fundamental aim of a protectorate was to secure the goodwill of rulers, creating a polyvalent relationship that strengthened the dependence of the order or "nation" on the cardinal protector while at the same time generating a debt of gratitude - and thus a patronage bond - between him and sovereigns. In the practice of protection, the office thus encapsulated both the relationship between prelate and protected and that between protector and ruler. A favor requested by a cardinal from a prince, even when sought for the benefit of those under his protection, was normally petitioned as a personal favor; if granted, both parties treated it as a benefit conferred upon the protector, who was in turn the ruler's client. Understood in this sense, protectorates can be seen as a vehicle for integrating churchmen into the crosscutting web of loyalties, affiliations, and personal obligations, secular and ecclesiastical, that sustained ancien-régime society.

The origins of the protection of the interests of states and nations at the Roman curia are unknown, but they are traced to the late Middle Ages on the basis of reports that Martin V tried, with little success, to restrict the practice in 1425. On that occasion the pope prohibited members of the Sacred College from assuming the personal protection of rulers, communities, and secular offices, in order to secure the loyalty of the cardinals and reduce the risk of new schisms [126]. The title of cardinal protector of states is still attested in the second half of the fifteenth century, until in 1515 a decree of the Fifth Lateran Council formalized the designation *promotores aut defensores*. The establishment in the 1520s of permanent protectorates for princes and states fixed their duties, which normally consisted in influencing the decisions of bodies such as the consistory and congregations, or members of the curia, including the cardinal-nephew, whom ambassadors and other agents of secular diplomacy found difficult to approach officially [127]. The first half of the sixteenth century was the period of greatest expansion of national protectorates, whose number was subsequently reduced as various countries broke with Rome. Because the protection of the interests of rulers, communities, states, and *nationes* was not clearly distinguished, the work of protectors straddled representation of "national" interests in Rome and defense of the ecclesiastical body and its papal head

inherent in the cardinalate, producing an ambiguous entanglement that reform efforts never managed to resolve. Cardinals holding a national protectorate could therefore also act as diplomatic representatives of the crowns they protected and might be designated by the sovereigns themselves. It is no coincidence that national protectorates became consolidated in the same period in which stable diplomatic relations were emerging between foreign states and the Apostolic See [128].

From 1555 until his death Giovanni Morone was protector of the Habsburg hereditary lands, and it was probably in that capacity that Cardinal Tolomeo Gallio referred to him in July 1572 as protector of Hungary [129]. In the same year he also became protector of England - and, until 1574, Ireland - during that country's brief return to Roman obedience. On this occasion the protector was appointed by the pope rather than by Queen Mary, one of the first exceptions to the principle that sovereigns selected the cardinals intended for this office [130]. For Morone, however, holding the protectorate of England meant above all assuming not only Pole's symbolic legacy [131], in years when the English cardinal was being reclaimed in hagiographical fashion both to defend those who had shared his religious orientations and to serve the broader propaganda of the Counter-Reformation [132]. Indirect evidence is provided by the summaries "on the restoration of the Kingdom of England" drawn up during Pole's legation and preserved in Morone's personal archive. They contained analyses of the English political and religious situation, indications of the institutional and legislative changes considered necessary to restore the country to Catholicism, and outlines of Pole's actions to that end. Morone's working papers also included extracts from letters by his English colleague, likewise "on the matter of the restoration," written between 1553 and 1554 [133].

Scholars have thus far paid little attention to diplomatic relations between the Roman court and England during Morone's protectorate [134]. Research has focused especially on the phase in which the irenic orientation of Pius IV's papacy and the pope's hopes of ending the English schism found expression in the illusion that the crown would agree to send representatives to Trent and enter into dialogue with papal agents sent to England and Ireland.

Neither Pole's former household member and Contarini's "master of the household" at Regensburg, Vincenzo Parpaglia [135], nor an experienced diplomat such as Girolamo Martinengo succeeded, however, in crossing the Channel and pleading the Catholic cause before Elizabeth's throne. The council reconvened at Trent without English participation, and Parpaglia himself began to work toward the queen's excommunication, while communications between Rome and London remained intermittent [136]. The reports from across the Channel that Morone periodically received in those years justified very little hope. An anonymous notice "on the affairs of England," for example, estimated that the country had twenty-seven cathedrals, fifteen of them vacant because their Catholic bishops had died and the other twelve with living ordinaries, ten of whom were imprisoned in the Tower of London "solely [sic] for the Catholic faith and the authority of the Apostolic See, which they are resolved to obey, and to suffer every martyrdom rather than recognize any other head in the Church of God than the pope." To fill the sees vacant *per obitum*, the writer suggested promoting "five of the most learned persons among the English Catholics who are at Louvain and elsewhere on this side of the sea," with the further recommendation that they be sent to Trent "to propose and discuss matters pertaining to the restoration of the kingdom to the true religion." The estimated cost was one hundred scudi per person for the journey and an allowance of one scudo a day during residence at Trent [137].

Morone personally followed the mission to England involving Abbot Martinengo. Commendatory abbot of Leno in the Brescian territory and later secret chamberlain to Paul III, Martinengo had been appointed in 1549 as papal representative at the court of Ferdinand I, king of the Romans. After considering him for the nunciature in Poland, Julius III confirmed his assignment, while from Vienna the abbot sent perceptive letters warning of Charles V's inability to contain the spread of Lutheranism. A secretary of Paul IV, Martinengo was appointed by Pius IV as apostolic nuncio to Elizabeth to urge her participation in the council. He set out in vain in March 1561, following the equally unsuccessful mission of Vincenzo Parpaglia the previous year, which Philip II had caused to fail before Parpaglia even reached the island. In May 1561 Martinengo was denied a passport after the capture of an English priest as he embarked in the Low Countries, an incident used as a pretext to denounce a papist conspiracy [138]. The correspondence between the Brescian abbot and

Morone in preparation for the mission shows Martinengo submitting to the cardinal questions about diplomatic strategy toward the queen, the symbolic forms of dress and behavior, remuneration, and lodging. The annotations in the supremely experienced protector of England's own hand on the margins of the abbot's requests reveal his diplomatic instinct. Asked how he should dress, the cardinal wrote, "Let him wear his ordinary habit." Asked how he should travel - Martinengo inquired "whether I should go by post, or by comfortable stages, reminding Your Most Illustrious Lordship that from my age and constitution no extraordinary speed can be expected on the journey" - Morone noted, "Let him travel by comfortable post stages: health requires this." To the question "whether in Flanders it will be proper for me to communicate my commission to Madame of Parma [Margaret of Austria]," Morone answered, "Let it be communicated." When asked how to react "if the queen . . . in speaking with me . . . should use some irreverent word toward the person and authority of His Beatitude," Morone advised, "Let him answer prudently and calmly." Finally, when asked what to do if "the queen, as one distant from the Catholic faith, should show that she receives me not as nuncio of the universal pastor of holy Church but only of a prince, or in some other manner involving a diminution of apostolic dignity," the cardinal's seasoned experience led him to evade the question, and with it the illusion that diplomacy could be governed by precise rules: "There is no need to consult on this, because it will not happen; and if it does, let him do what is appropriate" [139].

The failure to send English prelates to Trent and relations between the council and the queen greatly troubled Morone's work in 1563. Pius IV's ambition to assemble a genuinely universal council - expressed, as we shall see in a later chapter, in invitations to the Orthodox Russia of Ivan IV as well as to Elizabethan England - remained only an aspiration, now wholly incompatible with the irreparable nature of Europe's religious fracture [140]. While Vergerio thundered against Trent even through pamphlets addressed directly to Queen Elizabeth [141], the exiled leaders of English Catholicism at Louvain began to pressure the council fathers to excommunicate the sovereign. An official request to that effect reached Trent in June 1563 and was immediately forwarded by Morone to Rome, where it was discussed with representatives of the principal Catholic political powers [142]. The fury of Cardinal Granvelle, who believed the initiative to be a manipulation by the French crown and feared compromising Philip II's diplomatic efforts to save the lives of Catholics imprisoned in England, and the displeasure of Ferdinand I himself, who protested vigorously through Nuncio Giovanni Dolfin to Morone and the other legates, caused the proposal to be dropped. Ferdinand argued that the excommunication would in practice be unenforceable and would achieve nothing except to provoke the Protestant princes of the Empire. This was so even though Borromeo had meanwhile communicated that Pius IV was not opposed to including the excommunication in the Tridentine canons [143]. Morone declared himself convinced that "if such a thing were attempted here, it would be the total ruin not only of the little religion that remains in that kingdom and the certain death of those poor bishops, but also of all the Catholics in Germany" [144].

At the beginning of July Borromeo therefore wrote to the Milanese cardinal that "the reasons moving the emperor to advise that no action be taken against the queen of England seem to His Holiness prudent and well considered" [145]. English Catholic exiles nevertheless continued, even after the council ended, to regard Morone as a point of reference because of the protectorate he held [146]. Equally without real consequence was the mission of the young Thomas Sackville, son of the chancellor of the exchequer Richard Sackville and cousin of the queen. He reached Rome toward the end of 1563 without any formal mandate and was unsuccessfully used by Morone and Borromeo in an attempt to reopen relations with England through his influential father, with the prospect - discussed in meetings faithfully recorded by Parpaglia - of sending apostolic legates to London to reconcile Elizabeth. It was the chancellor himself who ordered his son on that occasion to end the dialogue immediately, advising him to be cautious on his return to England and to conceal his Roman meetings. Morone continued to correspond with Thomas Sackville, now back in his homeland, during the following year, recommending prudence [147].

State protectorates included jurisdiction over the respective national ecclesiastical institutions in Rome, which were in turn organically connected to the city's pastoral fabric. Roman diocesan authorities participated in the foundation of national churches and intervened in their administration, in a setting in

which foreigners - whether pilgrims or permanent residents - were integrated into national institutions, sometimes through craft guilds and other professional, devotional, and charitable organizations. Foreigners often came to Rome to escape wars at home, flee poverty, find work, and establish a new family, expressing religious sentiments of varying depth that touched the principal domains of existence - birth, marriage, death, and access to the sacraments - matters often falling within parochial jurisdiction. The tribunal of the cardinal vicar played a crucial role in relations between national communities and the Church, urging foreign associations to participate in diocesan religious ceremonies and ensuring that they submitted to the authority of the papal and diocesan curia and were integrated into local pastoral programs on both the liturgical and devotional levels. The nations therefore had to conform their statutes and regulations to those of other Roman associations in order to enter a kind of "confraternal movement" that, while leaving them autonomous in administration, was closely supervised by cardinal protectors as well as by ministers sent by their national sovereigns [148]. Not every nation represented in Rome could, of course, obtain protectors. Among non-Catholic groups, the Orthodox Balkan minorities benefited from having shared in an experience regarded as heroic, confronting the Turkish advance during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and found protection, for example, in Cardinal Santoro, founder of the Greek College in Rome. Needless to say, the Holy Office monitored the Roman presence of Protestant minorities, as well as Muslims and Jews [149].

The decades during which Morone protected several foreign *nationes* in Rome, while also attending to the affairs of the German College, therefore saw the consolidation of new balances and unprecedented intersections between Rome's traditional cosmopolitanism and a new papal universalism, relaunched through the conversionary institutions of the holy city. As in his experience with the Holy House, the cardinal protector found himself governing institutions that increasingly assumed the identity of outposts on a religious, ethnic, cultural, and ritual frontier internal to Catholicism, and that were ever more clearly characterized as organs of mission and conversion. Because their statutes were indeterminate, in Rome as elsewhere in Italy foreigners were traditionally defined negatively as those excluded from the privileges of *cives*. From the mid-sixteenth century onward, Rome and other states obedient to the Catholic Church tried to restrict the influx of heretics and other enemies of the faith. In Roman society, permanently resident foreigners could assimilate and attain positions of prestige without great difficulty, though this did not mean they were less closely watched [150]; the transient foreigner more readily became a target of the authorities responsible for public order. The presence of *nationes* enjoying immunity in embassies and sacred places reproduced political and religious frontiers within the city that were difficult to control. National churches, hospices, confraternities, and hospitals, often governed by prominent compatriots, could guarantee the foreigner's integration into the nation, the city, and perhaps the curia, even overcoming sharper social distinctions through common participation in religious functions, devotional rites, and charitable activity. Yet they were also religiously fluid places that received individuals without paying too much attention to their confessional allegiance and could therefore become receptacles of heresy or, conversely, if carefully disciplined, symbolic places of conversion or defense of the Catholic faith, including through targeted artistic patronage [151]. The Anglo-Saxon nations protected by Morone, and the German nation in which he took a closer interest, were linked by their origins on the shifting and porous frontiers of European Catholicism. The composition of Rome's national churches was often plural from the standpoint of both the definition and self-perception of the foreigners who belonged to them: the Flemings and Poles, for example, divided among themselves, while the Anglo-Saxons likewise differentiated internally and competed for aid and resources.

After the birth of the Church of England, Pole had attempted to turn the urban hostel for English pilgrims near the church dedicated to Thomas Becket into a college. Members of his household had lodged there, though Pole himself did not. The place embodied one of his favorite apologetic themes: the centuries-old loyalty of the English to the papacy, represented by generations of pilgrims. Once appointed legate and made archbishop of Canterbury, Pole continued to devise plans for integrating the hostel into his vision of Catholic restoration in his homeland. Even under Gregory XIII, Niccolò Ormanetto - Pole's collaborator at Canterbury - described the English cardinal's plan to convert the hostel into a school or seminary intended for members of the Catholic elite "to accustom them to the religion and language of this holy city," so that bishops might later be recruited from among them. This also reflected Pole's interpretation of the collapse of

English Catholicism under Henry VIII. Among its causes he identified the low social rank of the men promoted by the king to the episcopate and the resulting contempt shown toward them by the local aristocracy, which had prevented effective resistance to the sovereign's anti-Roman policy [152]. Morone would finally realize his friend's wishes at the very end of his life, succeeding in 1579, one year before his death, in having Gregory XIII establish the English College.

During the Canterbury years Pole had reacted coolly to Morone's educational projects, which presupposed a permanent Jesuit presence in England. To that end, in January 1555 Loyola first wrote to the king of Spain, who promised support, and then tried to obtain the protector of England's assistance with the legate. By March 1556, however, Ignatius had to admit that the mediation had failed to produce the results he hoped for [153]. Elizabeth I's accession then led Paul IV to consider using the revenues of the Hospital of Saint Thomas to establish a college for the training of priests who would return home as missionaries, in the spirit that had guided the foundation of the German College a few years earlier. Thanks to two Welsh intellectuals, Owen Lewis - a fellow of New College, Oxford, professor of canon law at the seminary of Douai, and later bishop of Cassano - and Morys Clynnog, likewise an Oxford-trained jurist and former student at Louvain, Bologna, and Padua, both favored by Morone and active within educational initiatives already functioning in the 1560s, the project of a high-level center for the education of the English Catholic clergy could take off only in the following decade [154].

A true college was established by Gregory XIII with the bull *Quoniam divinae bonitati*, issued on 23 April 1579 at Morone's proposal. It defined the structure of the seminary and entrusted the Jesuits with the task of preparing priests for the spiritual reconquest of England. The institution occupied the buildings of the hospice, which retained its character as an assistance center for English Catholics or converts to Catholicism fleeing persecution or banished from the kingdom. The previous year the Scots had likewise proposed to the pope that their own hospice be transformed into a missionary college, but it was only under Clement VIII that a Scottish College was founded in 1600 and placed under the control of Camillo Borghese, cardinal protector of the nation. Nor was any institution for the Irish erected under Gregory XIII. They were instead encouraged to develop ties with the German community, the church of Santa Maria dell'Anima, and the German College, which admitted six Irish students between 1562 and 1580 [155].

There is evidence from the 1560s of the care with which Morone performed his role as cardinal protector of the British nation in Rome. He vouched before the Roman Holy Office for an Englishman who had come to Rome 156 and decided that "at least during the Anglican schism" the English hospital should depend in every respect on the seminary, so that its rector would consequently become custodian of the hospital [157]. He carefully supervised accounts and the costs of maintaining individual students [158], received certificates of their progress [159], examined complete lists of those enrolled with indications of the courses they followed - theology, metaphysics, physics, logic, rhetoric, letters, and grammar 160 - and reviewed the usual variety of proposals to reform the regulations [161].

The protector periodically issued new ordinances, as Pole had already done in 1546 when he modified the hospital's earlier statutes "because of the difficult times," and Morone followed him in this as well [162]. His purpose was often to improve the organization of the college and hospital and strengthen discipline. The *ordinationes* published in February 1577 established stricter hours for rising and attending religious services; required students to be enrolled in the Jesuit Archconfraternity of the Most Holy Annunciation "and to perform their devotions and studies there" according to its rules; allowed the fathers teaching at the College to enter the students' lodgings while the latter were attending lessons; and laid down precise standards of conduct for the scholars [163]. The protector dealt with disciplinary questions 164 and financial imbalances [165], as well as internal conflicts between English and Britons. In an appeal presented to the cardinal in 1579, two student priests declared themselves convinced that there existed "a kind of natural matrix of discord," maintaining that "experience has taught that these two peoples cannot live together" [166].

Morone naturally knew the teachers attached to the institution. Some had performed missionary work in England, sometimes in collaboration with the Jesuits, as in the case of Henry Henshaw, an Oxford theologian affiliated with Lincoln College. In those decades the institute's teachers included several protagonists of the

English Catholic exodus under Elizabeth: Nicholas Morton, theologian and papal penitentiary *pro natione anglicana*; the theologians Charles Parker and John Seton, the latter holder of Pole's former chaplaincy in the English hospital; the doctors of philosophy and hospital chaplains Edmund Daniel, Edward Tailer, and Thomas Rirton; and other former fellows of Clare College, Cambridge, Corpus Christi, and New College, Oxford, supported by friends or by the hospital [167]. Morone's attention to the faculty is also shown by an internal proceeding against the college rector, accused by two English students of favoritism and incompetence [168]. The protector also kept the curriculum under observation and received suggestions in this regard that were not always easy to interpret. A certain Girolamo Pontano, almost certainly identifiable with the papal physician from Imola close to Santoro and Bellarmine, lecturer in philosophy at the Sapienza and author of a *De immortalitate animae ex sententia Aristotelis* published at Rome in 1597 [169], sent him a memorandum on improving the organization of philosophical studies at the college. Drawing a parallel between Morone and the English cardinal and stressing their deep human and spiritual bond, he held up Pole - not without some temerity, but as evidence of persistent admiration - as the man who "devoted himself above all to the renewal of literary and philosophical studies" [170].

The mature Milanese cardinal's affection for his deceased friend must for many years have guided his steps in the difficult work of the protectorate, which he pursued tenaciously until his death. A final spark of that friendship can be glimpsed through the eyes of a visitor who in 1576, during the few days Morone spent in Rome between his return from Genoa and his departure for Regensburg, inspected the hospital's accounts at the order of the vice-protector of England, Cardinal Francesco Alciato, and visited the church known as the Trinity of the Scots, served by the college students [171]. They had previously complained to Morone that the poverty of the church, "at present without chalices, vestments, and other things necessary for divine worship," made it necessary to draw up a list of objects to purchase "so that it may be properly served, as is desired, and so that we too may practice and learn these holy ecclesiastical ceremonies." The students also complained that there were only four chalices for seven altars and thirteen priests resident in the college, and requested some relic, "since we have none at all," as well as "some fine painting to place above the altars, which are bare" [172]. In the face of these complaints, however, the visitor was able to certify that the place of worship was in satisfactory condition, although the high altar had no altarpiece, and he recommended that one be made with an image of the Trinity. This led, shortly after Morone's death, to the commissioning from Durante Alberti of the painting still visible today. The altar of the Virgin was likewise found to be "worthily decorated," as were those of Saint Edmund, Saint Thomas, and Saint John, though the last had to be served with the church's vestments because it possessed none of its own [173]. The altar of Saint John the Evangelist, by contrast, stood beside the main entrance and hosted daily celebrations in memory of Thomas More. Morone had endowed it, "from his uncommon charity and pious generosity," with fifty gold scudi a year, "in memory of the most illustrious Cardinal Pole."

Chapter Twenty-Four

Among the “Foremost in Advising on Affairs of State”: Giovanni Morone and Confessional Europe

1. “All the Difficult and Laborious Matters That Arise Are Laid upon Him”

> The dean . . . is universally regarded as a capable man, knowledgeable and highly experienced in affairs of state, and by common consent counted among the foremost members of the College; all difficult and laborious matters that arise are laid upon him. He has had bad fortune, because, although he was judged worthy of the pontificate and it lay in the hands of the most illustrious Borromeo to make him pope, Borromeo did not know how to carry it through, and many men revealed themselves as his open enemies and prevented it. He is regarded as astute, artful, and inscrutable. He has also had another misfortune: although he is a good man, few believe it. It was thought that Paul IV wished to ruin him forever, just as others have followed the same course by accusing him in matters of religion, although he was vindicated; and despite being an old, employed, and respected cardinal, he is poor, never having importuned the pontiffs to give him anything, but having devoted all his skill solely to overcoming envy and ill will.

An anonymous diplomat presented Giovanni Morone in these terms in a *Report on the Court of Rome* dated 20 February 1574 [1], effectively summarizing the mature cardinal’s in several respects paradoxical position during the last decade of his life. A figure of great prestige, universally respected for his intellectual stature and “exemplary life” [2], and endowed with unmatched experience, especially in German affairs, the Milanese cardinal continued to exert considerable influence on papal policy [3]. Gregory XIII did not hesitate to include him on commissions established to deal with delicate inquisitorial cases that had international ramifications, such as that of the French bishop Paul de Foix [4]. Yet no one forgot what had happened to him under Paul IV, and many must have suspected what was moving behind the reassuring curtains from which emerged the image of an authoritative cardinal, a protagonist of European politics for forty years, though now definitively excluded from any prospect of papal election.

Spanish distrust and increasingly pronounced hostility toward him never changed. In appearance, to be sure, Morone continued to profess loyalty to the Catholic king, who addressed him in letters as “very dear and much beloved friend” [5]. Yet already in October 1568 Don Juan de Zúñiga judged his candidacy in a future conclave “a matter of great danger to the Church of God” [6]. A year later, while the Venetian ambassador reiterated that Morone was still to be regarded as “perhaps superior in virtue and ability to every other” member of the Sacred College [7], Zúñiga could observe with satisfaction that his party was much weaker than at the previous conclave and that his opponents were so numerous and powerful that he believed Morone had no chance of election [8]. Between the end of 1571 and the beginning of 1572 the Spanish ambassador repeatedly returned to the imminent papal election to recommend the secret exclusion of Morone and Alessandro Farnese, since both, though for different reasons, would be dangerous popes. It was therefore necessary to dissemble, “since they professed themselves great servants of the king, and to preserve them in such devotion.” His concern was largely superfluous, however, since “Morone’s candidacy is dissolving more every day, because he has great enemies in the Sacred College,” he wrote, declaring himself convinced that Morone “would be excluded without the king’s having to intervene in any way” [9]. On the eve of Gregory XIII’s election, betting placed his chances at only nine percent [10], yet this did not prevent many cardinals from fearing “that he might be made pope” [11]. Nevertheless, although he was still regarded as very “close to the emperor” Maximilian II [12], with whom Pius V always had dreadful relations, and was viewed with suspicion by the Holy Office, the Milanese cardinal continued to play a leading role in the curia of those years, though confined to what a Roman notice of 1 April 1570 called “affairs of state,” at whose discussion he was always present [13].

Pope Ghislieri entrusted Morone with responsibility for the complex negotiations that led to a brief alliance among the Catholic powers against the Turks [14]. On that occasion Zúñiga acknowledged that “no one in the Sacred College possessed his capacity and experience for conducting affairs of this kind,” as he wrote

on 29 December 1570, while noting that the pope had called him to the task “as a faithful servant and confidant of the king” [15]. There was no lack of reason to fear that Morone in fact intended to favor the Venetians, but Zúñiga could not avoid acknowledging his great qualities, briefly reconstructing the history of his relations with the Spanish sovereign in a passage worth quoting in full [16]:

> Until now his life has been more than exemplary, and had he not been suspected in religious matters as he was, no one would be more suited than he to become pope. When Don Juan Manrique was ambassador here, no cardinal was as closely attached to Your Majesty as he; but since what happened with his imprisonment, all of us ambassadors have been more cautious. From this, and from not having been sufficiently rewarded, he has derived cause for suspicion. He knows perfectly well that he no longer enjoys the same favor from Your Majesty that he once had, and he does not see himself supported in attaining the papacy, which has made him much colder than formerly in his desire to serve Your Majesty. When His Holiness granted the *cruzada* two years ago, he supported it; but afterward, when its renewal was at issue, he was much more reserved. His greatest enemy is the pope, and he has had to deploy all his capacity and skill to prevent the pope from reopening an investigation into him; most of the cardinals created by Pius V were appointed solely in order to exclude him from the pontificate. Even so, on the few occasions when the pope asks advice on affairs of state, he summons Morone; in the negotiations for the League he has relied heavily upon him, and he will always do so in affairs of this kind.

The negotiations for the League were concluded shortly afterward to Philip II’s full satisfaction [17], but this did not prevent him from once again excluding Morone’s candidacy in the conclave of 1572 [18], the last in which the cardinal took part. The following year, after Gregory XIII’s election, Zúñiga again emphasized Morone’s great authority “in all affairs of state,” which suggested that he should show himself friendly toward him and urge the sovereign to write to him from time to time, and that the

letters were not merely perfunctory. By now, however, Morone himself was aware that the favor he had once enjoyed with the Catholic king was no longer what it had been 19. In December of that year the Spanish ambassador continued to present him to the emperor as his “great servant” and as a man who possessed “great authority with the pontiff” 20.

Pope Boncompagni, who placed great value on “Morone’s prudence” and always consulted him “in difficult matters” 21, sent him as his legate to Genoa in 1575, charged with finding a solution to the very grave internal crisis into which the republic had fallen, and immediately afterward to Regensburg to address diplomatic and religious questions of continental importance 22, thereby inaugurating the path of “active neutrality” taken by the papacy in the second half of the sixteenth century 23. As late as 1578, according to Paolo Tiepolo, he and Tolomeo Gallio were among those “foremost in advising on affairs of state” 24, although it could be ruled out that he would be elected pope “because of the stain he once bore, […] though declared innocent” 25. In August of that year Philip II instructed his ambassador in Rome that in the event of a conclave the only man to be excluded, apart from the French cardinals, was Morone 26, as Zúñiga had advised at the end of the previous year, while reporting that “it is regarded as certain that he will not be pope” 27. In September the king sent him condolences on the death of his brother, Count Sforza, and in October Morone asked that, of the public offices Sforza had held, at least the senatorship be transferred to his nephew Girolamo; he also renewed his request that another nephew, Orazio, be appointed provost of Santa Maria della Scala in Milan 28. For his part, the cardinal never ceased to express his “constant devotion and observance” toward the Spanish sovereign 29.

Until his death, therefore, Morone remained a protagonist in decisive historical developments, achieving results that were in more than one respect surprising, given his age, his worsening ailments, and the labors and bitterness he had known over the course of his long life. In the end one may fairly say that Paul IV won his personal war against him: although he did not live long enough to condemn Morone after more than two years of imprisonment and a trial that lasted nearly a decade, he at least achieved the goal of preventing his election to the tiara. In other words, the bull *Cum ex apostolatus officio* proved substantially effective against Morone, for whom it had in fact been expressly promulgated. In the final years of his life, though “universally regarded as a man of great ability,” he remained, in the eyes of most, a man who had been investigated on a charge of faith. Yet he was an indispensable former defendant when it came to dealing with an extraordinarily broad range of affairs that engaged—and called into question—the role of Rome and of the Catholic religion. The political and religious fracture of Christendom, which men such as Pole, Contarini, and Morone himself had done everything possible to prevent, was now complete, and the consequences of the Peace of Augsburg had produced a relentless succession of negotiations, accommodations, and compromises to which the pontiffs had to resign themselves in order to salvage what they could in the lands of the Empire and contain the ever-deepening wounds in France and the United Provinces 30. The ambitious but intrinsically fragile initiatives of Catholic reconquest undertaken by the Church in the second half of the century; Rome’s attempts to support Catholic states involved in religious conflict and to repel the Islamic threat; the collapse of the pastoral dimension north of the Alps; the desired maintenance of good relations with the Habsburg bulwark and the attempt to influence changes of rulers in complex institutional settings such as the Polish-Lithuanian bastion; relations with the Orthodox Church; and the direction of the consciences of believers of different languages and cultures—these were the crucial themes of papal policy during the last decade of Morone’s life 31.

The final events in which the Milanese cardinal played a leading role thus unfolded within the new framework of a multiconfessional Europe. The same breadth of political and religious perspective, personal intuition, instinctive ability to get to the heart of problems and confront them with lucid realism, skill in moving along tortuous religious frontiers while trying to understand the reasons of his interlocutors, inclination toward irenicism, and willingness to experiment with compromise solutions—in short, the qualities that had prepared the way for Morone’s brilliant diplomatic career under Clement VII and Paul III —had also lain at the root of his imprisonment in Castel Sant’Angelo and of the theological hatred directed at him by Carafa and Ghislieri. Yet they were also the qualities that, from Pius IV onward, made him

indispensable once again, when history presented Rome with the heavy bill for the intransigent obstinacy that had prevailed in the Curia since the beginnings of the Reformation. The paradox of Morone's life can be summed up in the observation that his sensational trials for heresy and his extraordinary political and diplomatic successes—foremost among them the conclusion of the Council of Trent—were two sides of the same coin: the two faces of a hierocracy that, the further it moved toward the heart of the Counter-Reformation in Italy, the less it could imagine, from the standpoint of an overall strategy, that it could maintain a political presence in Europe by lighting inquisitorial pyres. When, after Morone's death, Gregory XIII approved the new calendar in 1582, it was accepted in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, but rejected in the Empire, which adhered to local calendars; in the Swiss Confederation, which preserved an exceedingly complex system of dating; and in England, Russia, and Poland, where Roman and Orthodox Christians adopted the Julian calendar 32. This fragmentation in the measurement of time was perhaps more emblematic than any other example of a West now divided by an ever more pronounced plurality of faiths and of a Rome moving toward gradual marginalization.

It is therefore true that Paul IV ultimately won his personal battle against Morone, but it is equally true that he left behind an ungovernable political legacy. The cardinal whom he had cast into prison was obliged to reconnect some of the threads Carafa had severed with the inquisitorial sword, once again taking up the weapons of negotiation and helping to steer the *navicula Petri* toward what was not so much a slow, weak, and fragmentary "implementation of Trent" 33 as the stabilization of the Counter-Reformation: between Roman centralism and missionary expansion, rigid controversial closures and new educational and charitable impulses, the primacy of obedience and the supervision of popular piety, the watchful repressive control of moral and intellectual life and passionate mystical transports. It was, in short, a world very far removed from the one in which the young Morone had entered the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the 1520s. Yet in that very different world his role continued to matter when the need to preserve the capacity for dialogue in a Europe divided by new frontiers and still threatened by Islamic expansion made plain the failure of the political and ecclesiological model imposed by the inquisitor-popes. That model had seen the Catholic Church imagine that it could close the ranks of orthodoxy in Italy while continuing to possess the human, moral, and intellectual resources needed to reach agreements and compromises beyond the Alps. While under Pius V and Gregory XIII the papal hierocracy began to reap the poisoned fruits of enforced religious pacification and of a confessional monolith destined to endure for centuries, unprecedented political and religious balances were being tested on the European continent, forcing even men such as Morone to reckon with new political and religious realities.

It is not difficult to identify the reasons for the unease with which the leaders of Catholicism prepared to engage diplomatically with states undergoing profound transformation, while achieving only very modest results. In the German Empire, where the Peace of Augsburg was far from establishing a stable confessional division, the balance between local autonomies and universal institutions, together with the permissive policy of Maximilian II, managed overall to contain political and religious conflicts until the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War 34. The religious map of the Habsburg hereditary lands—Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, and part of Hungary—was equally composite. Thanks to the autonomous strength of the nobility and the tolerant inclinations of the sovereigns, these territories witnessed the decline of Catholicism and the development of multiconfessionalism in the second half of the sixteenth century. Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anabaptism in its various forms, and antitrinitarianism were practiced alongside traditional Orthodox Christianity and the presence of Jews, Muslims, and Hussites in the more easterly regions. Morone was kept informed by the apostolic nuncio in Vienna, the protonotary apostolic Melchiorre Biglia, whose Milanese origins had connected him with the cardinal's family 35. In a letter of September 1568 Biglia informed him in advance that, in response to the demands of the Austrian nobility, Maximilian had promised "a certain tolerance or connivance, but under certain conditions," above all "that only that Augsburg Confession which was presented to Emperor Charles V in the year 1530 be discussed" 36. The hope that the emperor's "good disposition" intended merely "to delay these people, so that with time their evil designs might dissipate" 37 was destined to be disappointed. Later that year Maximilian II issued a decree permitting Lutheran worship throughout almost all of Austria 38. As could be expected, this step—taken immediately after the Diet of

Vienna had shown itself accommodating in paying the emperor's heavy debts—deeply disturbed Pius V. In the face of the pope's tears, even cardinals regarded as pro-Habsburg, such as Morone, Truchsess, and Colonna, felt obliged to join in the appeals urging the emperor to reverse his decisions. It is significant, however, that on that occasion Ghislieri, at a consistory hurriedly convened on 17 September, resolved to send Cardinal Giovan Francesco Commendone rather than Morone as extraordinary legate to the emperor 39, probably because the latter was considered less reliable for inducing the Habsburg ruler to retrace his steps.

To remain with the regions in which the Milanese cardinal had exercised or would exercise his influence in the 1570s, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—a vast conglomerate institutionally uniting the Kingdom of Poland, including Ruthenia, the Duchy of Lithuania, and Royal Prussia, whose creation in 1569 had been warmly welcomed by Pius V in the hope that it would limit the spread of Protestantism in the East 40—also offered a clear example of multiconfessionalism in the second half of the sixteenth century. The reign of Stephen Báthory (1576-86) ushered in a long period of religious pacification guaranteed by laws enacted at the request of an aristocracy among whom the Reformation had spread widely. After his death, by contrast, the elective succession of Sigismund III Vasa and the accession of the new Swedish dynasty began the transformation of Poland into a compact bulwark of Catholicism between Protestant Germany and Orthodox Russia. Elsewhere in western Europe, as is well known, tensions between political struggle and religious liberty produced states that consolidated their Reformed identity while retaining the Catholic ecclesiastical structure apart from clerical celibacy, as in Elizabethan England; or new entities such as the republic of the seven United Provinces, which broke away in 1581 from the ten southern provinces of the Netherlands restored by force to Spanish rule. Elsewhere still, they led to the legitimation of biconfessionalism, as in France, which sank into the civil wars of the second half of the sixteenth century, brought to an end by the accession of Henry IV of Navarre and the Edict of Nantes in 1598. In the homeland of the "Most Christian Kings," the spheres of religion and politics began to separate, although this first embryo of state secularization would be neither unopposed nor definitive. Pope Clement VIII would nevertheless have to acknowledge it by recognizing Henry IV of Bourbon's succession to the French throne and his title of Most Christian King.

Within this new international framework, the foreign policy of Pius V, to which Morone was called to contribute despite his status as a de facto defendant of the Inquisition, continued the effort to achieve religious uniformity through the struggle against heresy and the preservation of the territorial boundaries of Tridentine Catholicism. The two principal European objectives of Ghislieri's pontificate were to safeguard Roman ecclesiastical jurisdiction and to establish an alliance of Catholic princes against Protestant heresy and the Turkish threat in the Mediterranean. These aspirations, however, won the unconditional support neither of the rulers of Spain and France nor of the emperor. The mission of 1566 to Maximilian II—again entrusted by Ghislieri to the newly created Cardinal Commendone 41—failed to prevent that year's diet from considering questions that the pope regarded as belonging exclusively to his own jurisdiction. Only the financial aid promised by Rome persuaded the Habsburg sovereign shortly afterward to promulgate the Tridentine decrees in those areas of the Empire that had remained Catholic. Philip II also accepted them in Spain, Naples, and Milan, but jurisdictional questions—especially those concerning Lombardy and Sicily—continued to trouble relations between the Iberian monarchy and the Holy See. Charles IX of Valois, finally, refused the official publication of the conciliar decrees in France and consented only to the obligation of residence for French bishops. Pius V could do no more than continue sending briefs directly to the prelates beyond the Alps ordering observance of Trent 42.

Within this asymmetry between a multiconfessional continental Europe and a western Mediterranean watched over by the three Inquisitions and dominated by a ruler incapable of confronting problems except as an "endless succession of particulars"

(to use Braudel's memorable description of Philip II's policy) 43, Rome needed representatives of international stature, moral credibility, political reliability, and intellectual preparation to contain the constant Protestant and Muslim pressure and preserve the pockets of Catholicism in the heart of the continent. Pius IV had already renewed the organization and personnel of the nunciatures, creating new ones in Savoy and

Florence and extending the circle of diplomatic relations between Rome and lands now outside Catholicism —for example, by authorizing Commendone's mission to Denmark and Sweden in 1560-61. Under Gregory XIII the network of nunciatures comprised thirteen posts, five of them in the Italian peninsula, operating in continuity with what has been called the "gradual gestation and revival of the theory of papal primacy" that developed in the 1570s and 1580s 44. Yet very few men in the Roman Curia of the eighth decade of the century possessed the qualities required to meet the renewal of international policy to which the Counter-Reformation papacy aspired, precariously poised between serving as a center of coordination in containing Ottoman expansion and as a permanent mediator in conflicts within the Catholic camp itself 45.

Among those men Giovanni Morone stood out. Under Pius V he found himself once again subjected to inquisitorial proceedings while at the same time burdened with arduous responsibilities, which—as had always been the case—he met with patient determination. Among them was his decisive contribution to preparing the historic victory of the Christian fleets over the Turks at Lepanto on 7 October 1571. It was a success achieved tenaciously, after laborious negotiations that managed, if only briefly, to overcome the particular interests and mutual mistrust of the Mediterranean powers.

2. The Brief Season of Lepanto

The pressure exerted by Pius V on Philip II to induce him to form a league with France and the Empire against the Ottoman Porte dated from the beginning of his pontificate and was not discouraged by the mediocre results achieved throughout the second half of the 1560s. In the autumn of 1566, deeply shaken by the fall of the Hungarian fortress of Szigetvár, which nonetheless succeeded in slowing the Turkish advance toward Vienna, Pius V established a commission—of which Morone was a member alongside Farnese, Granvelle, Commendone, and Da Mula—to form an anti-Turkish league with the Empire, Spain, and France 46. Throughout 1567 the pope continued to press Philip II to go to the Low Countries, imagining that this would help unite the Catholic forces of Europe to suppress disturbances and revolts in those lands and then transform them into an anti-Turkish league operating between the Balkans and the Mediterranean. In the following years he multiplied initiatives in this direction, increasingly alarmed by the French crown's willingness to negotiate with the Huguenots, as became apparent in January 1570, with the risk that some form of religious and political recognition might be granted to their demands. Once French unwillingness had become clear, in March 1570 Pius V turned to Philip II of Spain and Sebastian I of Portugal to negotiate the formation of a league with Venice and the Holy See against the Ottoman Empire. There were, however, many difficulties, not least the irritation of the Habsburg courts at the bull of 27 August 1569 by which the pontiff had granted Cosimo de' Medici the grand-ducal crown of Tuscany, arrogating to himself the right to confer titles outside his temporal jurisdiction 47. The political picture was further complicated by the consequences of the excommunication of Elizabeth of England, pronounced in February 1570, which legitimized every act of rebellion by the English against the perfidious Jezebel, and by Philip II's and Charles IX's refusal to publish the decree in their kingdoms 48.

Yet whenever the great affairs of European politics once again moved to the center of Pius V's friar-dominated Curia, Morone inevitably returned to a leading role, beginning with the commission on the League established in 1570, as is shown, among other things, by the renewed appearance of his name in diplomatic correspondence with the Spanish court 49. It is significant, for example, that when Don Luis de Torres was sent as extraordinary nuncio to Philip II to conduct the negotiations, Morone wished to give him a letter dated 13 March 1570 in which he reaffirmed his "ancient and devoted […] service" to the Catholic king and urged "that good and prompt resolution demanded by the present condition of the times and by the service of Your Majesty and your realms" 50. Although he cordially detested him, the pope granted Morone "a very long audience" in consistory, and the commission's meetings were usually held in the cardinal's rooms 51. Difficulties abounded, as did disputes between Venice and Spain over the objectives of a military effort that the former wished to direct eastward and the latter toward the North African coast. Despite his reputation as a man who "understands nothing of reasons of state, since he reasons differently from everyone else" 52, Pius V continued stubbornly to weave his design in the months that followed.

Faced with the growing likelihood of an attack by the Sublime Porte against Cyprus, and in exchange for substantial financial aid, the pontiff succeeded in involving Venice in the project of a league with Spain open to all other Catholic states. Fearing possible Ottoman aid to the Spanish Moriscos and attracted by the prospect of new acquisitions in the East, Philip II finally agreed to recognize Medici's grand-ducal investiture and to negotiate the granting of assistance both to foster Catholic opposition in England and to join an offensive and defensive league against the Turks, entrusting the matter to Zúñiga and Cardinals Pacheco and Granvelle. The mission of the pope's representatives to the king of Portugal met with less success. Sebastian did not join the league, nor did he take up the proposal of a union between the Aviz and Valois dynasties by marrying the sister of the king of France. For Pius V such an outcome would have had the advantage of obstructing the projected marriage of Margot to Henry of Navarre—a marriage that was in fact celebrated and culminated in the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre during the night of 23-24 August 1572. That tragic outcome was not unrelated to the spirit of retaliation generated by the Battle of Lepanto and the growing political weight of Spain in the Mediterranean theater.

To coordinate the diplomatic effort aimed at uniting Catholic military forces, Pius V established a congregation presided over by Morone and also composed of Cardinals Farnese, Orsini, Madruzzo, and Granvelle, the last of whom was Philip II's de facto spokesman. The Milanese cardinal had little confidence in the pontiff's diplomatic acumen; as he would write to Philip II after Ghislieri's death, the pope had spent much of his life among the cloisters of convents and the choirs of churches 53. The other members of the commission likewise seemed at first to place little hope in the outcome of the initiative, since from the earliest meetings they recommended against creating an independent papal fleet and favored instead subsidizing an undertaking by the other Catholic powers. Pius V decided otherwise, in part because Venice, fearful of Spanish supremacy, immediately declared that it would agree to the common expedition only if papal ships under a papal admiral took part 54. The rivalries and jealousies of the two greatest Mediterranean powers, and the unstable political and military situation—in those weeks Nicosia capitulated and Cyprus was invaded by the Turks—did little to calm the commission's work. It is significant that from the first meeting among the Spanish, Venetian, and papal delegates, Philip II's representatives raised the question whether the proposed league was intended to wage war against the Turk or against all infidels. Venice, which from 1570 to 1573 separately fought the War of Cyprus, ending with the loss of the island, feared that the king of Spain intended to present himself as the leader of a new crusade in order to gain naval and economic preeminence in the eastern Mediterranean and secure for himself the *cruzada* and tithes the pope might grant him at the expense of the lagoon republic.

It was Morone himself who spoke authoritatively on 4 July 1570 against including all infidels among the league's military objectives. Reversing Granvelle's position, he argued that other Muslim peoples, including Persia, should instead be drawn into the struggle against the Ottoman Empire 55. The Hospitaller knight Bartolomeo Sereno, who, though not an eyewitness to the events, served in the papal infantry in Cyprus, described those decisive moments in dramatic words 56:

> On the 4th [of July], all the others having assembled, except Alessandrino [the cardinal-nephew Michele Bonelli], who was indisposed, and the [Venetian] ambassador, the business was begun in the name of the Holy Spirit. The most illustrious Morone, in grave words full of prudence and feeling, considered the present need of Christendom and the only remedy for sustaining it, namely the proposed league; […] and in His Holiness's name he exhorted everyone to devote themselves to this, which would be to the glory of God and the common benefit. All confirmed the same with universal satisfaction. […] Cardinal Morone […] said that the Sophy [the Persian sovereign] too was numbered among the infidels, and yet it was hoped that his aid might be obtained.

The Peace of Saint-Germain-en-Laye between Charles IX and the Huguenots, signed in August, made agreement among the Catholic powers seem even more urgent and rekindled the pope's anger and official protests. At the beginning of autumn, mediating between the Catholic League and the viceroy of Naples, Morone worked hard to obtain Sicilian grain at a fixed price 57, while Commendone, on his way to Poland, met Maximilian II in Vienna in an effort to draw him into the coalition. The emperor, however, adopted a position he would maintain until the Diet of Regensburg in 1576 and declared himself unwilling to take part

in a conflict that, as far as his dominions were concerned, he regarded as closed by the Peace of Adrianople of 1568, even though that treaty had confirmed Turkish dominion over the Hungarian lands and imposed a humiliating annual tribute on the Empire.

This disappointment brought negotiations for the League to a standstill for several weeks. They resumed only with difficulty in November and centered on the appointment of the second-in-command of the unified fleet. The general inclination—with which Morone agreed 58—was to entrust supreme command to Don John of Austria, Philip II's brother and captain general of the Spanish fleet in the Mediterranean. The pope, however, insisted that in Don John's absence command should pass to the admiral of the papal galleys, Marcantonio Colonna, who was disliked by Gian Andrea Doria and the Spaniards. Faced with the obstinacy of Pius V, who was ready to withdraw from the negotiations if thwarted on this point, Morone deployed his diplomatic skills and mediated directly with the Catholic king, inviting him to recognize that the agreements reached thus far had been much more favorable to Spain than to Venice. At the same time, he admitted that he too was astonished at the pope's stubbornness over what was in reality a secondary issue. "We believed […] that we had finished everything," he wrote to the Spanish sovereign, "and the pope was entirely satisfied and expected the same satisfaction in the others; but the contrary has occurred" 59. At the same time he forcefully reminded the pontiff of the grave harm threatening Christendom should the negotiations fail, as Philip II was informed 60.

Morone's particularly authoritative voice within that commission is confirmed by the fact that on 16 December 1570 it was he who wrote to the Spanish sovereign proposing that Don John of Austria command the Christian armada in the "enterprise against the Turk," with the duke of Alba as his substitute, and guaranteeing that the pope and Venice would gladly accept the arrangement. Although professing himself merely "one of the deputies," the Milanese cardinal said he felt authorized to write this short letter in his own hand solely because of his desire that the negotiations reach a successful conclusion "and the manifest benefit of Your Majesty." It was an attempt to smooth over the disagreements between the Spanish sovereign and the pontiff—"His Holiness cannot be forced, but he can indeed be persuaded," he explained—placing the full weight of his prestige in the balance to reach an agreement, while conscious of the narrow room for maneuver granted him by Pope Ghislieri: "I can do little," he wrote 61. The following day he addressed another letter to the powerful prince of Eboli, Ruy Gómez de Silva, asking him to help resolve the disputes between Madrid and Rome and persuade the sovereign to set aside every point of pride and give "the pope the satisfaction and thanks owed him for the great labor he has endured." He then entered into the outstanding issues—the duration of the alliance, the number of soldiers, the division of costs, the definition of the expedition's principal objectives, and command of the armada—to urge everyone toward concord, since in the event of failure "what I do not wish to predict might follow, and may God preserve us from it" 62. A compromise was finally reached: the king of Spain would propose the names of three captains—Requesens, Doria, and Colonna—and ask Pius V to indicate which should serve as his brother's lieutenant. If chosen, Colonna would undertake to relinquish command of the papal galleys.

On the basis of these agreements, in May 1571 the delegations finally signed the general pact in Rome 63. Morone's conduct—he was truly the "soul of the negotiations" 64—was appreciated by the Spaniards as balanced and equidistant in patiently repairing the divisions. As Zúñiga wrote to Philip II on 29 December 1570 65:

> In all the negotiations Morone and the pope's other trusted men have shown themselves entirely neutral and have performed their part very well in bringing about this alliance. We have managed to keep them on our side more often than the Venetians, also because we have much more often been in the right. […] Now, when discussion has returned to the questions concerning the strongholds of Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, we have seen Morone strongly favor the Venetians; we have attributed this to the resistance he encountered from them to his desire that the alliance be made by whatever means possible.

The Milanese cardinal's contribution was decisive also when Pius V seemed on the verge of giving up because of internal divisions in Venice, where one faction favoring a bilateral accommodation with the Porte —with which the Serenissima had for centuries shared commercial interests and treaties 66—was opposed by another that supported the offensive league but rejected the conditions imposed by Spain regarding

reciprocal obligations and contributions. After consulting Commendone, on 6 April 1571 Morone sent Marcantonio Colonna himself, who was very popular in the lagoon city, to Venice with instructions to threaten to return to Rome unless the pope's conditions were accepted and implemented by 8 May. Through this initiative the cardinal succeeded in overcoming the principal difficulties and giving the republic all the guarantees it demanded for reimbursement of the expenses it had incurred 67. To this end the pope also decided to subject the cardinals' incomes to a "contribution" levied on their total personal revenues, as a counterpart to the 200,000 scudi imposed on the Venetian clergy and the 40,000 scudi exacted from twelve Italian monastic congregations to arm the papal galleys. In a letter of 16 July 1571 the king of Spain acknowledged Morone's generous efforts and "the great importance of his action […] in obtaining the momentous result that has finally been achieved" 68. In his reply, dated 13 October, after a period spent "outside Rome at the baths" to treat his ailments, the cardinal assured him that he had "labored very willingly in the service of God and for the public benefit of Christendom," but also "for the greatness of Your Majesty and the security and expansion of your states." He urged the king to spare neither expense nor effort in maintaining that "sole and immediate remedy for the preservation of the Christian commonwealth against the many forces of the Turk" 69.

Once the distribution of financial burdens had been settled, in the summer of 1571 the fleets finally assembled at Messina under the command of Don John of Austria. The naval expedition, consisting of more than two hundred vessels, put to sea in mid-September. On 3 October news arrived of the capitulation of Famagusta, the last Venetian stronghold in Cyprus, and at dawn on 7 October the fleets clashed at Lepanto, near the Curzolari Islands, in a bloody battle in which the Christian armada prevailed over the Turkish fleet, though at heavy cost 70. The victory made an enormous impression throughout Europe and had far-reaching consequences for Marian devotion. The favorable outcome of the naval battle was attributed to Mary, and in the consistory of 17 March 1572 Pius V proclaimed that the first Sunday of October should be consecrated to Our Lady of Victory 71. Some, such as Cardinal Bobba, wished to congratulate Morone personally on "the victory that the Lord God has been pleased to grant us against the Turks through that Holy League, in which Your Most Illustrious Lordship has had so great a part" 72. Morone himself immediately congratulated Philip II, to whom "divine goodness has granted as much glory as it has ever granted any other prince in the world in a naval battle," he wrote in his own hand on 30 October, expressing the hope that the king would commit himself to "keeping this League united and enlarging it, without which it will not be possible to attain the desired end of destroying, or at least reducing, the power and pride of this great enemy of our faith" 73. Less than two months later, on 19 December, while rejoicing with the Catholic king over the birth of his son Ferdinand, he again evoked the "many and most signal graces" with which God continued to favor him, "as the great goodness, virtue, and religion of Your Majesty deserve" 74. Others preferred to emphasize the crusading spirit that had animated the Catholic alliance and suggested extending its objectives to the struggle against heresy. A "servant and kinsman" of Morone, for example, Pompeo Della Croce, the Spanish-Milanese ambassador to the Swiss Confederation, reminded him that "so great a victory as Our Lord has granted should be employed both with arms and with reputation, not only against the Turks but also against the perfidious heretics, since the elimination of this wicked sect is no less useful to the service of God than that of the Mohammedans" 75.

The emperor drew from Lepanto the hope that Croatia might rebel against the Ottoman yoke, as the duke of Urbino's ambassador to the Serenissima wrote to Morone. For his part the cardinal kept himself informed about an actual military effort to raise Albania, financed by several Italian princes and led by Giacomo Malatesta, whose aim was to capture Valona and recover for Catholicism the part of Dalmatia under Turkish rule 76. The historic victory, however, failed to create a stable alliance among the Catholic powers, since almost immediately Philip II—to the pope's profound disappointment and without consulting his allies—redirected Spanish strategy in the Mediterranean toward North Africa. His plans for the conquest of Algiers meant abandoning the ambitious Venetian project for an attack on the Ottoman Empire, about which Morone continued to receive information 77. Meanwhile France again drew closer to the Turks and in April 1572 concluded the defensive alliance of Blois with England, ignoring Pius V's request to support Spanish intervention on behalf of Mary Stuart. The embittered pope died in Rome at the beginning of May. In June

1572 the Milanese cardinal vainly summoned the other members of the papal commission and the Spanish and Venetian ambassadors to his house in an effort to renew the alliance 78; in July he sent conciliatory messages to Philip II, who continued to regard him as his most authoritative political interlocutor in the Curia 79.

The diplomatic reputation of Pius V's successor, Gregory XIII, was no better. The Venetian ambassador judged him "austere and difficult by nature, well intentioned, but of mediocre intelligence and little experience in the conduct of affairs of state" 80, while the Este ambassador called him "good and […] just, but stubborn in his opinions, so that once he had taken a course it was impossible to move him from it" 81. In reality Boncompagni, an eminent Bolognese canonist, had already cultivated international relations and experience under Paul IV. In 1556 he accompanied Cardinal Carlo Carafa to the courts of Paris and Brussels. Two years later he served on the commission charged with examining the legitimacy of Ferdinand I's imperial succession. Appointed bishop of Vieste in preparation for the nunciature in Germany, he resigned the see at the beginning of Pius IV's pontificate, although that pope had recognized his important role in the final phase of the Council of Trent and created him cardinal in 1565. The Milanese pope had also named him legate *a latere* to Spain to conclude the inquisitorial trial of Bartolomé Carranza. The failure of that mission, due to Philip II's resistance and Pius IV's death, nevertheless won him the sovereign's favor, which later proved decisive in the conclave that elected him pope in May 1572 82. Morone described him to the king of Spain as "learned and good, but without arrogance," a lover of "justice, but with due moderation" 83. In his reply of 8 July Philip II thanked Morone for what he had done in the service of God and His Church; on 22 July he thanked him for always being available "in whatever concerns my service," as had always been the case, and assured him of his "good will," which he would know how to demonstrate whenever the occasion arose 84. He reiterated this on 26 October in a letter enclosed with one sent to the ambassador in Rome, instructing him, among other things, to deliver it to the cardinal with whatever gracious words he could find 85. The Catholic king therefore quickly understood that under the new pontiff as well Morone would play a political role far from secondary.

The men who chiefly assisted Gregory XIII in managing affairs of state were Morone—foremost among those "who conduct affairs of state here"—and Gallio. They sought to keep an increasingly unstable Holy League alive and urged the Catholic king to come to Italy, which "would be a great comfort to his vassals and would confirm them in the fidelity and love they owe their king," while also strengthening the ever more inflamed front in the Low Countries, as Zúñiga wrote on 2 April 1573 86. Already in July of the previous year the Spanish ambassador had reported that "Cardinals Morone and Como are the men who now have their hands most deeply in affairs of state," and in his judgment they had acted very well during the long negotiations to renew the League 87. After Venice's withdrawal, however, the negotiations became increasingly difficult, even though in February 1573 the Milanese cardinal, "a great confidant of the emperor," informed him that he had received a letter in which Ferdinand I declared himself willing to join the alliance 88. On 12 April the Spanish ambassador wrote that "in matters of such importance the pope did nothing without his advice," and a month later that "Cardinal Morone has great authority in all political affairs" 89. Philip II, he repeated on 12 June, should therefore give him some recognition for his "good offices" 90.

The ambassador subsequently continued to ask the king to thank the Milanese cardinal for his collaboration in obtaining heavy levies on Spanish ecclesiastical property to finance the war against the rebellious Low Countries 91. The confidence Pope Boncompagni placed in him made him all the more valuable an interlocutor in the changed Roman climate. In international politics the new pontiff—whom someone described as a stubborn man "of harsh and dry nature" 92—showed a temperament very different from the compassionate and legalistic one evident in other episodes of his life. Famous is his jubilation on learning from the cardinal of Lorraine of the French massacre of thousands of Reformed believers on Saint Bartholomew's night, only a few months after his election. He chose to celebrate it with a solemn *Te Deum*, public festivities, and a medal proclaiming the *hugonottorum strages* 93. Moreover, although he made no secret of his aversion to Pope Ghislieri and to the friars with whom he had surrounded himself and upon

whom he had bestowed every kind of privilege and exemption, those who expected him to relax inquisitorial severity were at least partly disappointed. The implementation of Tridentine reform and the struggle against heretics and infidels remained priorities under the new pontiff as well.

Desiring to preserve the anti-Turkish league, Gregory XIII urged Philip II to resume the initiative and threatened to revoke the financial benefits Spain had received from Pius V. He also established a new commission on the alliance which, like its predecessor and several others, met “very often” in Morone’s house for long confidential discussions on matters the cardinals were forbidden to reveal on pain of excommunication 94. His principal proposal to the Catholic king was that at least part of the Spanish fleet be placed at the allies’ disposal, in order to prevent Venice from concluding the separate peace that everyone now anticipated 95. New negotiations over the campaign to be undertaken against the Ottomans took place in Rome at the beginning of 1573, once again involving Spain, Venice, and the papacy, represented among others by Gallio and Morone. The latter, however, fell gravely ill in mid-January, to the point that “his life is feared for,” as a Roman notice of 16 January reported 96.

In the bleak international setting in which Mediterranean problems and the Empire’s coldness were compounded by Roman anxieties about England, the political and religious alliance between the Holy See and Spain inevitably remained the pivot of papal policy. Yet many factors counseled the pontiff to proceed cautiously in his relations with the Iberian crowns. Intent on launching an attack against the Barbary states of North Africa, Philip II had no intention of lending himself to papal naval plans in the eastern Mediterranean. Nor was the Portuguese crown more cooperative, lacking the resources needed to mount an effective effort against Ottoman expansion. The truce with the sultan concluded by Venice in 1573, the Barbary reconquest of La Goletta and Tunis in 1574, the continuing reluctance of Catherine de’ Medici’s France to join the pope’s anti-Turkish plans, and finally the widespread conviction that after Lepanto the Ottoman fleet no longer posed a real threat marked the definitive end of the alliance. The contest for the political and religious reconquest of the Mediterranean was now over, and the crusading spirit was directed more against heretics than infidels. Even so, as late as October 1574 Morone tried to persuade Zúñiga that the only solution was to revive a league among the pope, Spain, all the princes of Italy, and the republic of Genoa, capable of fielding an armada of 150 galleys and 30,000 infantrymen 97.

By that date, in fact, the gravest problem for the Spanish monarchy and the papacy no longer lay in the Mediterranean but on the North Sea, in the Low Countries, where the revolt of the northern provinces raged and the breaking of the dikes forced the Spanish governor Don Luis de Requesens, Zúñiga’s brother, to abandon the siege of Leiden. The military and financial commitment on the Flemish front

obliged the Catholic king to reduce his commitment against the Turk at sea. On this issue too the Milanese cardinal was a trusted adviser to the pontiff. In the pope’s name he suggested to the Spanish ambassador that the troops be withdrawn from the Low Countries and the government entrusted to a member of the local nobility. It was once again, as throughout his life, the strategy of dialogue, mediation, and compromise, and the rejection of war as an instrument or substitute for politics. “Morone knows perfectly well how important the preservation of those states is, but he has always declared himself convinced that they could never be pacified by force and that, even if some success were obtained, it would always be necessary to reach an agreement with their inhabitants,” Zúñiga wrote on 29 October 1574 98.

3. Germany and the “Nunciature of Reform”

The fading of Mediterranean hopes prompted Gregory XIII to devote renewed energy to Germany. These developments were encouraged not only by the pressure of Cardinal Otto Truchsess of Augsburg, who until his death in April 1573 tried to redirect the designs that had failed in the East to the advantage of German Catholics 99, but also by the pope’s desire both to strengthen curial centralism further and to renew the role and organization of the nunciatures. These were transformed into centers of ecclesiastical reform through the creation of new posts at Lucerne, Graz, and Cologne and the dispatch of the first nuncio to the Spanish Netherlands, a prelude to the establishment of a permanent nunciature at Brussels under Clement VIII. The first of these developments is well exemplified by Gregory’s policy of strengthening the central organs of

government, consisting both of the permanent congregations established by his predecessors—the Holy Office, the Council, the Index, and the Bishops—and of temporary ones. The institutional system centered on the congregations, which received its definitive form under Sixtus V, entailed a further concentration of decision-making power in the pope's hands and a corresponding loss of prerogatives by the consistory, also because of the increasingly marked tendency of pontiffs to assign specific, mostly bureaucratic, responsibilities to individual cardinals. The model of the prince of the Church that some Renaissance cardinals, including Morone himself, had proudly embodied was now destined to disappear.

Some of the temporary congregations established by Pope Boncompagni remained in operation throughout his pontificate or continued after his death, among them the congregation for the Greeks of Italy and the German Congregation itself, which developed from the precedents of the cardinalitial commissions created in the 1560s. Perhaps the most important of these had been the commission appointed by Pius V in 1566 "on the affairs of the Diet of Augsburg," in which Morone naturally took part. The circumstances that led Ghislieri to establish it are best understood in light of Roman anxieties before the imperial Diet of Augsburg of 1566, at the opening of which Maximilian II delivered a speech emphasizing the need for religious reconciliation in the Empire 100. His intentions had long been known. At the beginning of 1565 Truchsess had already explained them to the Jesuit superior general Francisco Borja, an intimate of Ghislieri and Borromeo. It was again the cardinal of Augsburg who, in a letter to Morone of December 1565, expressed fear that the diet would adopt an irenic attitude toward the Protestants and thereby create a greater danger for the Church than any it had faced in the past. In this climate, five days after his election and even before his coronation, Pius V established the commission "on German affairs." At first it comprised only four cardinals—Morone, Farnese, Borromeo, and Dolfin—but Reumano, Gallio, Altemps, Truchsess, and Cristoforo and Ludovico Madruzzo were later added 101. Within this body, presided over by the pope and directed by Morone, the position advanced by Dolfin—an ambiguous mediator with Maximilian's court 102—was rejected. Dolfin would have preferred that a cardinal without the legatine cross be present at Augsburg. Instead, the consistory of 23 January resolved to send Commendone to the diet in solemn form, with instructions condemning the holding of religious debates within a secular governing body of the Empire and demanding that the diet itself promptly publish the Tridentine decrees. Particular emphasis was placed on the need for organizational and moral reform of the dioceses and on the introduction of Catholic colleges and seminaries in the imperial territories. The records of this commission, which also promoted a Catholic response to the *Magdeburg Centuries*, have not survived 103.

The German Congregation, established in 1573, had more enduring aims and greater political resonance. The imperial court received it with irritation, seeing in it an improper intrusion into Maximilian's religious policy 104. It was charged with developing a coherent policy for the problems of the German Church, addressing religious questions that remained unresolved in those regions, coordinating diplomatic contacts with the emperor and princes who remained loyal to Rome, and more generally safeguarding Catholicism and attempting to restore it in lands that had become Protestant. Until his death the Milanese cardinal presided over the congregation's meetings, which were usually held at his residence. The fact that the presidency was not entrusted to the protector of the German nation—first Truchsess and then Ludovico Madruzzo, who took charge only after Morone's death—has been interpreted as evidence of the pope's limited favor toward the political orientations of those two imperial cardinals, whom he considered too conciliatory 105.

The creation of this cardinalitial body prompted a flurry of speculation. In February 1573 the nuncio in Vienna, Giovanni Dolfin, bishop of Torcello, informed Gallio that the court, besides viewing its establishment unfavorably, was anxiously following the meetings of the cardinals in Morone's palace in Trastevere. The emperor wished to know how German religious questions were being treated, while rumors circulated in the Habsburg capital that the congregation was discussing "doing in Germany against the heretics what was done in France against the Huguenots." These rumors had to be denied as quickly as possible, "since this nation is by nature very suspicious" 106. In Paris itself, the nuncio Anton Maria Salviati reported, the initiative was assumed to be entirely political, and it was predicted that the congregation

intended to pressure Maximilian II to undermine at the diets the dignity of the German princes of Protestant faith 107. More realistically, as early as January 1573 a secretary of the imperial embassy in Rome wrote to Vienna that the congregation was charged with devising “what course should be followed to provide some good and immediate remedy for the preservation of the Catholics and also to win over some of the heretics” 108. The plan presented by Nuncio Dolfin at the beginning of 1573 discussed the confessional situation created in Germany by the Peace of Augsburg and proposed an ecclesiastical reform of Catholic Germany, to be entrusted not only to the emperor’s support but also to constant coordination among nuncios, ecclesiastical and secular princes, and urban magistracies. It was thus a thoroughly political vision. It began from the recognition that imperial power in religious matters had been weakened by the territorial princes’ *ius reformandi*, and concluded that papal enclaves had to be used as bases from which the nuncios could initiate direct negotiations between Rome and Catholic princes and promote missions for the spiritual reconquest of Germany 109.

This plan would be partially realized in the following years through the dispatch to central Europe, coordinated by the congregation itself, of men whose mission was to urge princes to introduce Tridentine norms into the territories they governed and, where possible, to recover those that had been lost by restoring the Roman hierarchy and attempting to convert princes and government officials to Catholicism 110. This ambitious policy aimed at establishing a “nunciature of reform” in the German lands has been the subject of important studies, which have highlighted the increasingly close connection that developed in the second half of the sixteenth century between the internal affairs of the Catholic Church and the work of the nuncios, whose character was consequently transformed. Originally more similar to diplomats representing secular princes and governments 111, under Gregory’s *Reformnuntiatur* the apostolic nuncios, especially in the German lands, increasingly resembled senior papal bureaucrats endowed with broad powers of reform and jurisdiction. The thirteen nunciatures then existing in Europe began to exercise reserved rights on a permanent basis and to manage affairs—including trials, even in matters of faith, and the collation of benefices—that elsewhere belonged to bishops, chapters, or other ecclesiastical authorities. Under Pope Boncompagni this transformation made the implementation of the conciliar decrees, the reform of ecclesiastical structures and Catholic religious life in the Empire, and the attempted reconquest of dioceses that had passed or were passing to Protestantism a significant break with the past, summarized in the attribution of ever broader powers to the nunciatures and their diplomatic functions 112.

Although historians today place less emphasis on Gregory’s *Reformnuntiatur* in southern Germany between 1573 and 1583 as a decisive moment in Rome’s ambition for Counter-Reformation restoration in the German world 113, there is no doubt that the appointment and rotation of nuncios, even for short-term assignments, were linked to concerns that were perhaps more political than religious. Recent research has above all emphasized the enormous difficulties Rome encountered in maintaining a regular nunciature in important cities, especially Cologne, and the constraints imposed on the nuncios’ activity by the need for continual mediation and jurisdictional agreements with secular authorities even in Catholic states. A particularly successful example of such negotiations is provided by the articles agreed in 1583 between Nuncio Feliciano Ninguarda and the duke of Bavaria, which became a model for similar treaties in the Habsburg hereditary lands as well 114.

The writings of the Jesuits active in Germany during these years—the Dutchman Peter Canisius and the Germans Hermann Thyraeus and Johannes Rhetius—are a valuable source for showing how high the expectations of educated German Catholics were for the establishment of the German Congregation. As will be recalled, ever since the religious colloquies Morone had become convinced that the revival of Catholicism in Germany would depend above all on renewing the education of the clergy. Canisius therefore insisted on the need to refound the German College, create Jesuit seminaries, promote and protect the mediating activity of the nunciatures, and more generally make the dialogue between Rome and German Catholics solid and continuous. Morone’s enduring relationship with Canisius has already been mentioned, although Zaccaria Dolfin, while judging the Jesuit “truly Catholic and pious,” did not regard him as “the most versed man in the world in those doctrines in which anyone who today wishes properly to defend the authority of Our Lord

must be especially well trained" 115. In those years Thyraeus and Rhetius likewise repeatedly urged the pope to send upright, disinterested, and permanently resident men to the various German provinces, while naturally making better use of bishops who could apply the Tridentine decrees more effectively. The character of the German Congregation was built around this true program of action, and its activity was animated by Jesuit appeals for dialogue with Catholic princes. After meeting Ferdinand of Tyrol and Albert V of Bavaria, Canisius himself went to Rome to present the results of his diplomatic efforts to the congregation. Through him the two princes expressed to the cardinals and the pontiff their satisfaction at the desire to establish regular channels of communication with German Catholic rulers. They pointed out that sending permanent nuncios was the most suitable means of renewing popular religious life, improving the morality and qualifications of the clergy, and rebuilding the close relations with Rome that Germany had maintained before the Lutheran deluge 116.

Morone addressed these problems from the Roman vantage point of the congregation and once again verified their urgency when he returned to Regensburg in 1576, an extraordinarily busy year for him. Despite the meager results obtained on terrain bristling with nearly insurmountable difficulties, leadership of the congregation enabled the dean to retain a central role in curial policy toward German and imperial affairs. He was able to negotiate certain delicate questions directly with the princes 117 and also reviewed all the correspondence arriving in Rome from the German nunciatures, often concerning meetings between apostolic representatives and Catholic rulers. Those letters, which he frequently annotated and summarized, could be despairing in their constant insistence that Rome resolve the perennial problems of clerical ignorance and immorality and the countless ecclesiastical abuses that the pale results of Trent were now plainly far from remedying. In September 1573, during a meeting between the nuncio and Archduke Charles of Habsburg, governor of Inner Austria (*Innerösterreich*), Ferdinand I's third son declared that he had always desired that "the ignorance and evil life of ecclesiastics" be overcome, that "concubinage and the marriage of priests" be eradicated, and that the friars who had "plundered the monasteries, alienated their property, and carried even the chalices off to Italy" be punished, that

it would be better to drive them all out "than to tolerate so much infamy from them" 118. Faced with this situation, the congregation's daily work was concentrated mainly in four areas: drafting proposals for the pope concerning the appointment of nuncios in Germany; supervising, financing, and directing their activities in relations with Catholic princes and local ecclesiastical authorities; efforts to establish Catholic schools and seminaries in German cities; and reforming the German College in Rome.

As Canisius wrote in a memorandum submitted to Morone in 1576, the chosen nuncios had to be "learned in theological controversies, more than moderately proficient in Latin, zealous, of irreproachable morals, and free from every trace of greed." Assigned to three permanent posts and endowed with broad powers, they were to be assisted by "secret nuncios" who would support their work and intensify communications between Germany and Rome. These papal agents were to be selected from among the German students of the German College. Service as a shadow nuncio would be the first step in their diplomatic careers, with the prospect of appointment as official nuncios if they distinguished themselves by ability and morality 119. This policy appears in fact to have been applied in the congregation's practice during the 1570s. In May 1573, for example, when Bartolomeo Porcia was sent as nuncio to northern Germany, he was accompanied by the auditor of the Rota Kaspar Groppe *tamquam nuntius apostolicus*. In subsequent years the documentation never referred to Groppe by the official title of nuncio; he had in fact been charged with assisting and, if necessary, supervising Porcia's conduct and reporting it to Rome. Moreover, the predominance of Jesuits as teachers at the German College, as well as theologians and spiritual advisers to princes and rulers, meant that in the following years men from the Society itself, and not only their students, were assigned special missions and nunciatures. Canisius himself was frequently employed by the Roman Curia as a "secret nuncio" from the 1550s through the 1570s 120. It was Morone's political and cultural sensitivity that suggested assigning to each nuncio a German assistant who knew the problems of the territory and at the same time spoke Italian 121, probably drawing on the operational strategies he himself had refined during his missions in Germany.

As far as can be seen from the protocols of the congregation's meetings, a large part of the work of the apostolic nuncios in Germany during Morone's presidency consisted in managing relations with episcopal administrators, priories, and chapters, above all in order to safeguard the succession of Catholic prelates. One event requiring particular attention was the incorporation of the ancient and prestigious princely abbey of Prüm, consecrated by Leo III in 799. After a long struggle with the archbishopric of Trier that had begun at least in the fourteenth century, upon the death of the last abbot in 1576 the chapter was compelled, at the pope's will and on the advice of the congregation, to accept the loss of its self-government and incorporation into the diocese 122. As for the border territories, the commission was chiefly concerned with the electoral archdioceses of Trier and Mainz and the bishopric of Würzburg, the only three outposts—apart from the cities hosting official nunciatures—where Rome could hope to expand the Catholic frontier. By contrast, the dioceses of Regensburg, Bamberg, and Speyer, though still Catholic, were in disastrous condition for want of men and resources. Among the many bishoprics already occupied by Protestants, the only ones where recovery seemed possible, according to the congregation, were Halberstadt, Magdeburg, Naumburg, and Merseburg, although attempts to launch initiatives of religious reconquest appear to have remained on paper 123.

As already noted, Morone had contributed with Cervini and Loyola to the foundation of the German College, decreed by a bull of Julius III in 1552 124. At that time direction of the institution had been entrusted to Pedro de Ribadeneira, while Loyola had drafted the constitutions that regulated its life for two decades and assigned six cardinal protectors to supervise the teaching provided by members of the Society of Jesus. Partly because of Paul IV's hostility toward the Ignatian order and the college itself, the institution's mission had for several years been undermined by the meagerness of the resources available to it, consisting almost entirely of the annual donations of the pontiffs and founding cardinals. The goal of preparing young German aristocrats destined to combat Lutheranism from the highest ranks of the ecclesiastical career had been almost entirely abandoned. By the beginning of the 1570s the college attracted largely Italian boarders, mostly nephews of cardinals and popes: Pius V alone placed there some twenty relatives and protégés 125. In May 1573 Gregory XIII judged that the time had come to refound it. He assigned it an income of ten thousand ducats for the support of one hundred students and ordered its definitive transfer to Piazza Sant'Apollinare 126.

These measures were discussed by the congregation and must themselves be understood within the new role assigned to the nuncios. "He will try to send to Rome, to the German College, some boys of good disposition, especially sons of heretics," reads, for example, the instruction given to Nuncio Porcia in June 1573 127. The reform of the college was prepared by an intense debate that divided the cardinals. On one side were those who, within Gregory's logic of a Roman Catholic offensive in Germany and the establishment there of episcopal and Jesuit seminaries, though also moved by nepotistic aims, regarded reform of Roman educational structures as less urgent. On the other were those, such as Morone and Canisius himself, supported by Albert of Bavaria, who considered the German College the most suitable instrument for maintaining a qualified Catholic presence in German lands. On that occasion the congregation resolved to retain the possibility for Italians to be educated in the college, though in residential facilities separate from those of the Germans. This solution was opposed by the rector, the Jesuit Sebastiano Romeo, who, in agreement with the future superior general of the order, Everard Mercurian, sought to restore the original conception and succeeded in persuading Gregory XIII to accept the position of those who wished to transfer the non-German students to other Jesuit educational institutions in Rome 128.

The emperor also entered the debate over the German College through the nuncio in Vienna, Giovanni Dolfin. The plan Dolfin presented to Morone, and obtained his approval for, reiterated the need to develop as quickly as possible an effective program for improving the education of priests in German lands and expressed the hope that the recruitment of prospective priests directly in Germany, within local colleges, might be made easier. As an expert in German affairs, however, Morone had foreseen the problems that would be encountered in founding new colleges in German dioceses. He was also aware that recruitment beyond the Alps would chiefly concern members of the urban bourgeoisie rather than the aristocracy. He

therefore successfully urged Gregory XIII not to abandon his plan to strengthen the German College, while also preserving the expansion of Jesuit colleges and episcopal seminaries in the German dioceses. This was the strategy for educating the German clergy that the German Congregation would promote in the years to come 129. The congregation also supplied the cardinal protectors of the college—Morone, Farnese, Altemps, Gallio, and Madruzzo—who possessed broader powers than at the institution's beginnings, ranging from the drafting of rules and statutes to the selection of students and their placement in Germany, with authority also over the assignment of the benefices they would hold. The cardinalitial body further decided that the college could recruit Hungarian, Bohemian, Polish, and other students from territories with a substantial Protestant presence, although this decision was not in practice implemented. In 1580 the German College was merged with the Hungarian College, founded the previous year with the same objectives 130.

The following years in fact vindicated Morone's intuition, for the cardinals devoted far less energy to the thorny issue of founding Catholic colleges in Germany. Perhaps also because of the division of labor that had developed in earlier decades between the recruitment of German aristocrats at Rome and of future non-noble prelates in German colleges—only those of exceptional merit being allowed to spend their final year of study in Rome 131—the Roman commission took few decisions, although it discussed several projects for new colleges in southern Germany and considered Constance, Augsburg, and Dillingen. Morone personally supported the last of these prospects, though without concrete results. Nor were the results much more encouraging in predominantly German-speaking regions outside the imperial structure. Only in the strategic town of Braunsberg, the Polish town of Braniewo, whose location made it an outpost for attempts at religious conquest in eastern and northern Europe, was a Catholic seminary opened in 1579, attended by twenty-five students; a Jesuit college already existed in the region, then occupied by Sweden 132.

Chapter Twenty-Five

“Take the Good When the Better Cannot Be Had”: The Pacification of Genoa

1. The Political Crisis of the Republic

At the turn of the 1570s the European political and religious situation continued to change tumultuously, forcing Pope Boncompagni to adjust the Holy See’s lines of intervention, though they followed directions not very different from those of his predecessor. The death of Charles IX in May 1574 and the accession of his brother Henry III, who hurried to France after rapidly abandoning Poland, where he had been elected king at the beginning of the year, gave the pontiff hope that he might revive in Europe an anti-Huguenot and anti-Turkish strategy based on a Franco-Spanish alliance. As soon as news of the succession of the last Valois reached Rome, Gregory XIII assembled a council of cardinals, at which Morone suggested immediately appointing two nuncios to be sent to Poland and France 1. This led to the repeated dispatch to Paris in 1574-75 of the extraordinary nuncio Fabio Mirto Frangipani, who nevertheless achieved no encouraging results. Greatly weakened by the continuing civil wars and constrained by the queen mother Catherine de’ Medici, the French throne was little inclined to meet the pope’s expectations, while the ambiguous positions adopted by the king’s brother and heir, Francis of Alençon, whose possible marriage to Elizabeth of England was also discussed, gave Rome no cause for hope. In May 1576 Henry III in fact signed the Peace of Beaulieu, which granted the Huguenots freedom of worship throughout the kingdom except in Paris, provoking the pope’s condemnation and the formation of a Catholic League under the leadership of the dukes of Guise 2.

While the international scene once again took on colors very different from those desired by Rome, during the Holy Year of 1575 the pontiff’s anxieties were increased by the conflict that broke out in Genoa between the “old” and “new” nobles over the government of the republic. The dispute greatly alarmed Gregory XIII because of the key role of the Ligurian patriciate in sustaining Spanish finances through its loans and helping to contain at sea the ever-present Turkish threat 3. Boncompagni’s anxiety about the outcome of the internal situation in the Dominante is shown by the fact that at first he considered going to Liguria himself as a peacemaker. Only later, on 18 March 1575, after obtaining the consent of the consistory, did he decide to send a legate of peace. “Saying that the importance of the matter required the dispatch of a person of the highest experience and authority,” he appointed Morone, calling him his dear brother and “a cardinal who, just as he is dean, is likewise superior to the other cardinals in ability and prudence.” He was “the greatest man the Apostolic See possesses,” the Venetian ambassador commented 4, and in the following weeks he would closely follow developments in the affair. Gabriele Paleotti expressed all his admiration for that now elderly and

ailing man “who neither because of his years nor because of illness ceases from his continual labors and heavy burdens,” from whom he had received the salutary advice to abstain from “certain extremes of life and severity toward the body,” from harsh ascetic practices “neither praiseworthy nor sustainable” 5. As the pope had predicted, the Genoese question would soon become even more heated because of Philip II’s diplomatic intervention and the dispatch of Don John of Austria to Lombardy, which gave rise to fears of a Spanish invasion. Morone once again handled this explosive situation with sagacity and balance, succeeding in March 1576 in reaching an agreement, at first thought impossible, on a new constitutional text, the *Leges novae*. These proved capable of creating a stable political regime destined to endure until the end of the ancien régime.

To understand what was at stake and the merits of the Milanese cardinal’s action at that juncture, it is necessary to take account of Genoese developments in the preceding decades and of the precarious balances of power on which the city’s political system rested in the sixteenth century. The “century of the Genoese,” the long phase of preeminence enjoyed by the businessmen of the Superb in the financial service of the Spanish crown from 1557 to 1627 6, rested on the economic and political structure built by a closed nobility

that was “local and at the same time cosmopolitan,” whose character had been shaped by the constitutional reform of 1528. That reform established the principle that membership in the Genoese aristocracy was defined by having held public office before 1507. A *Liber civilitatis* was therefore compiled, while the term “nobility” gained currency even though historically it had denoted a political faction rather than the ruling class as a whole, to which the “popolari” also belonged. The solution adopted in 1528 was thus destined to reproduce an internal division between Old and New nobles, the former associated with the Portico di San Luca and the latter with the Portico di San Pietro. This division also reflected new social models founded on consciousness of status, the recovery of genealogical trees, and the distinction between political and blood nobility 7.

The extended Genoese family was connected to the urban structure of its neighborhood and therefore constituted a social group defined above all topographically. Residential settlement expressed a clientage network, and during the fourteenth century both came to be designated by the term *albergo*. Applicable in both noble and popular contexts, this form of alliance grouping was expressed through unified ceremonial, endogamy, and neighborhood ties, according to a model that probably derived from extended noble families of feudal origin after their settlement in the city. Popular *alberghi*, by contrast, arose from more recent alliances among families advancing toward political preeminence and therefore likewise capable of weaving clientage-based alliances 8. Genoese nobility, understood as political nobility, thus drew its identity from the intersection of three perspectives: residence, marriage ties, and economic alliances, which culminated in the mercantile companies underlying the greatest fortunes. In this framework the reform of 1528, “inspired by the ideal of union,” outlined a new and original arrangement and opened a new phase in Genoese history 9. On the one hand, recognition of the rights of families whose members had held public office before the popular revolt of 1506-7 revealed the conservative desire to regard that episode as a rupture in the history of republican government 10. On the other hand, the reform established the union of popular and noble families, creating Genoese nobility as a new social class that would remain hegemonic until at least 1797. The noble families were divided into twenty-eight *alberghi*, even at the cost of sanctioning alliances without an authentic social basis. The enrolled nobles—noble citizens over eighteen who had themselves registered—numbered 1,934, belonging to about three hundred families 11, though they were divided by growing tensions between Old and New nobles that finally erupted in the crisis of 1575 and were recomposed under Morone’s aegis by the Constitution of Casale of 1576.

In the 1570s the republic of Genoa experienced a crisis that the principal Mediterranean powers of the age—Spain, France, the Empire, and the Holy See—feared might degenerate into a “popular” upheaval 12. The offensive of the New nobles, who held power from the spring of 1575 to the winter of 1576, was seen internationally as the emergence of a dangerous faction, yet the neighboring crowns proved unable to devise a common response to the risks it posed. Divided and paralyzed by internal conflicts, France could only send to Genoa an able diplomat, Giovan Galeazzo Fregoso, who nevertheless achieved no success. Spain itself, for which the services of Ligurian bankers were indispensable, failed at that juncture to articulate a constructive position. Only Rome succeeded in becoming a genuine interlocutor for the parties, confronting the crisis effectively and renewing the papacy’s capacity to intervene in the affairs of the Dominante, of which sixteenth-century history had already provided eloquent examples: from Julius II’s organization of the naval expedition against Genoa in 1510 to provoke the anti-French insurrection that would occur two years later, to Clement VII’s use of the republic as a pawn in his changing strategies for containing Habsburg and Valois predominance in the peninsula.

In 1547, by contrast, Paul III’s attitude toward the Fieschi conspiracy had been ambiguous. Behind an official lack of interest dictated by the delicate Tridentine situation lay interventions connected with the private interests of the papal family, including the dispatch by Duke Pier Luigi Farnese of four galleys to support the conspirator. The pope’s son regarded the strengthening of the Valois role in Genoa, which would have resulted from the success of the pro-French Fieschi coup, as a means of consolidating the family’s newly created state in the Po Valley 13. More generally, the increasingly important role assumed by Ligurians in managing papal finances and their growing investments in the Roman credit market

strengthened relations between Genoa and Rome, alongside, of course, the “almost symbiotic” relationship between the Genoese patriciate and the Spanish monarchy 14. It is significant that the republic was never the seat of a nunciature, even after the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis prepared the way for apostolic nuncios to be established in Florence and Turin. In the second half of the century Spain was the only power permanently represented in the city by an ambassador, and it succeeded in maintaining that diplomatic monopoly despite Genoese attempts to overcome it 15.

It was within this triangular interplay of interests among Madrid, Genoa, and Rome that, during the events in which Morone took the leading role, the decisive function of the pope and the Roman Curia emerged as a factor of mediation and support for greater political autonomy of the Dominante from both Philip II and Maximilian II. Relations between Genoa and the House of Austria had deteriorated after Charles V’s abdications, when the new Spanish sovereign began replacing the feudal order his father had fostered in northern Italy with a system centered on Milan and on the royal powers represented there by the governor. The Ligurians did not forget the failure of the Genoese occupation of the small imperial marquisate of Finale in 1558, followed by Ferdinand I’s harsh response threatening invasion of the republic from Milan unless his rights were restored 16. Partly because of this precedent, the majority of the New nobles who governed the republic during the crisis of 1575 viewed with great suspicion Maximilian II’s decision to send two “commissioners” to the city as mediators. Indeed, it was precisely the title *commissarius* assigned to the imperial representatives that provoked the indignation of Genoese leaders, since it seemed to imply that the emperor claimed decision-making authority in the republic’s internal conflict as he might have done in a German city. Meanwhile Pietro Fauno, bishop of Acqui and the higher-ranking commissioner, worsened the situation by emphasizing in his opening audience the emperor’s supreme authority and presenting him as a benevolent father distressed by the disagreements among his beloved Genoese sons 17.

Open clashes between the Old and New nobles had begun during Carnival, whose celebrations were organized along rigidly hierarchical lines, with different types and locations of tournaments and spectacles reserved as a strict monopoly of the “old” nobility. At the end of January the annual disputes over enrollment in the nobility had recurred, provoked by the fact that, in defiance of the laws of 1528, no cooptations had taken place since 1568 because of the restrictions imposed by those already enrolled. The explosive combination of discontent among aspirants and Carnival alignments created a pre-insurrectionary situation in the city. At that time the secretary of the republic was the “new” noble Matteo Senarega, an intellectual of international education and extensive personal connections 18. The growing conflicts concerned not only admission to the nobility but also the republic’s institutional structure itself, which rested on the grouping of noble families into *alberghi* whose surnames they had assumed but never truly accepted. Since the eight governors had to come from different *alberghi*, and a rule of ineligibility prevented newly elected officials from belonging to the same *albergo* as their predecessors, the system disadvantaged the largest and most powerful families 19.

The disputes that made the situation dramatic also concerned the so-called *garibetto*, the body of laws that in 1547 had restricted the role of drawing lots in appointments to the councils, government, and distribution of offices, thereby overturning political balances and redefining legislative power. They established that the Great Council and the Minor Council were to be elected by a body composed of various holders of public office, including the *sindacatori*. The concentration of power was completed by changes to the procedures for electing the doge and conferring offices 20. The disagreement in this case was between those who wanted equal participation by Old and New nobles in the councils and government—in practice, representation by orders, guaranteed by the *garibetto*—and those who sought to overcome organization by *alberghi* and strengthen the random mechanisms of drawing lots, thereby in effect denying the existence of distinct orders and aiming at representation that might be called “by head.” At bottom, the divisions were driven by cultural differences centered on the still evident distance between lifestyles and marriage alliances. “The old nobles, who in former times were accustomed to trade in merchandise, had in these years turned entirely to exchange dealings and contracts with princes, especially with the court of Spain, in which many of them had made excessive profits,” Giovan Battista Spinola noted, for example, in his seventeenth-century *Commentarii*.

“This was endured with great displeasure by the new nobles, partly from envy and partly from resentment” 21. The differences were also reinforced by an opposition between a noble ideology on one side and a civic-republican ideology on the other, itself a product of the numerical composition of the Genoese nobility, about 60 percent of whom belonged to the New nobles and therefore favored random mechanisms of cooptation.

The contradictions of the laws of 1528, which were moreover not published until the summer of 1575, had already emerged in the Fieschi conspiracy against Andrea Doria in 1547. They were clearly expressed in the fact that the summit of the state consisted of perpetual procurators—former doges who had passed judgment by the Supreme *sindacatori* after their two-year term—and ordinary procurators—former governors who had likewise received a favorable review. Together with the doge and serving governors, the procurators formed the Colleges, the republic’s true organ of political government. The procurators also controlled municipal revenues, provisions, coinage, trade by land and sea, and the affairs of Genoese merchants “in every part of the world,” as the laws of 1528 stated. They also possessed jurisdiction over every kind of crime, over “reforming morals,” and over “rebuking and restraining all those whom they shall know to be vicious and to err with scandal to the public majesty” 22. These were therefore undefined and extremely broad powers, further expanded in 1547 when the Colleges extended their intervention to the election of councils and offices.

After an initial phase of negotiations between two delegations convened in the convent of San Domenico, the Old nobles’ entrenchment in defense of the existing order led between 14 and 16 March 1575 to open insurrection. A kind of popular army was created in support of a broad coalition extending from weavers and shop apprentices armed with pikes and arquebuses to the seven Deputies of the New nobles at its summit. These deputies had been established in 1574 to reform republican institutions and “watch over affairs of state and report them to the Deputies of the Old nobles” 23, who in turn had been created with purely defensive functions. The Deputies of the New nobles organized the military aspects of the revolt, while the Old nobles abandoned the city, leaving the republic in the hands of the New.

2. Morone’s Legation

These alarming reports were discussed in Rome at the consistories of 17 and 18 March 1575, during which the pope delivered an impassioned speech on the dangers of imminent war in Italy and Europe, “*non sine maximo discrimine reipublicae christianae*.” Hence the decision to send Morone to Genoa with legatine authority, preceded by a man of proven experience and prestige, Giovan Francesco Canobio, who arrived in the city on 23 March and immediately set to work preparing for the arrival of the dean of the Sacred College 24. Naturally, not all the nobility was prepared to welcome with open arms so imposing a figure as a cardinal legate of such renown, a living testimony to the papal determination to influence the internal affairs of the Dominante. Filippo Casoni’s *Annali* would summarize the situation very well, stressing that “many in the government […] abhorred this novelty for fear that matters, which in their judgment had already been well established in favor of their party, might be altered.” They therefore “artfully interposed delays and obstacles, both ceremonial and substantial, to the reception of the legate,” although in the end the Senate had to yield, receive him, and avail itself “of his marvelous talents” 25.

According to other sources, the cardinal’s fame caused the Genoese to await him almost as a “prophet sent by God,” as one reads in the diary of Marco Gentile, a member of the oldest Genoese nobility, who also expressed fear of Spanish intervention should Morone’s mission fail 26. Meanwhile the nuncio in France, Anton Maria Salviati, after informing the sovereign of the legate’s appointment, reported to Rome that the pope’s choice, “given those disturbances” in Genoa, had been “greatly praised and judged most worthy” 27. He then informed Henry III that although Morone was “heavily burdened by old age” and not “in very good condition to undertake journeys,” the pontiff placed great trust “in his ability and experience.” Seeing “so much division” in Genoa, the pope “had not wished to leave anything undone in order to remedy it and extinguish at its birth a fire which, if allowed to spread, could produce endless damage and disorder.” Salviati hoped that the king of France would understand how decisive the pacification of the Dominante was for the political balance of the region and for the internal peace of the French kingdom itself, although, he

added, “even if he acts otherwise, the rebels of France will think to make use of it, seeing dissatisfaction arise among the Italians, who have always given much aid to the crown of France in these wars” 28.

In Rome, by contrast, the duke of Ferrara, speaking through his resident Giulio Masetti, regretted Morone’s departure, as Masetti wrote to him on 19 March. The cardinal nevertheless replied with great spirit 29:

> I told His Most Illustrious Lordship that even if I saw this legation of his directed toward an end much more honorable and important than it is, I could not help grieving at His Most Illustrious Lordship’s absence from this court, both for the service of my most excellent prince, who in all his affairs has recourse to him alone, and because I see here so great a need for his advice in matters that may arise of such consequence to this Holy See and to all Christendom. Moreover, His Most Illustrious Lordship is already of an age in which bodily repose would be more fitting than toil. Yet I said that I wished to hope in the Lord God that He would grant him such strength and grace that, to his great praise, he would bring the disagreements of Genoa to an end and return so quickly that the affairs here pertaining to the public good would not suffer at all from his departure. His Most Illustrious Lordship replied that he willingly obeyed everything commanded him by the vicar of God, and that death could come to find him in Genoa just as well as in Rome, because the distance from here to heaven is the same as from Genoa to heaven; and that by now, as far as he himself was concerned, it would be better to withdraw from affairs that bring shame rather than honor, because he had already received honors enough, and their multitude makes men proud, whereas disgraces humble them, and that for him it was more salutary

to be humbled than to become proud.

While Morone was awaited, in Genoa Canobio found himself besieged by the “private passions of these citizens, with which my ears are filled at every hour” 30. The corporate representatives were being renewed: the New Nobles appointed four “pacifiers of the people,” while the “people” named three new deputies. Masses during the week after Easter drew more than 10,000 people, in a succession of speeches and ceremonies organized by the neighborhood political and military structures, whose leadership also included members of the College of Doctors and several notaries, in a spirit of solidarity between nobles and non-nobles. Senarega himself delivered a speech designed to define the political strategy to be followed on Morone’s arrival, one that clearly revealed the polarization of the conflict with which the legate would have to contend. The opposition was explicit between the supporters of the laws of 1528, despite their limitations —regarded as a moment of unity because their provisions prevented either faction from gaining predominance—and the partisans of the laws of 1547, issued after the Fieschi conspiracy and responsible for the “distribution of all honors” among “a few ambitious citizens.” According to the future doge, therefore, they should “give infinite thanks to God that, this deadly law having been destroyed by the universal consent not only of the citizens but of all Liguria, He has called us back to the observance of the true, vital, and holy laws of 1528, fashioned by the Holy Spirit” 31.

The formidable task entrusted to Morone was being watched with concern in the neighboring Grand Duchy of Tuscany, where Francesco I de’ Medici received reports that “the settlement of Genoese affairs” had now become impossible, since there were “armed men and the gates of the city closed.” His agents also insinuated that “Cardinal Morone’s intention is to keep those Genoese entanglements going” merely to allow Spain to intervene, as seemed to be suggested by the rumor that Don John of Austria had already landed “incognito in Italy.” In Rome Giulio Masetti went so far as to argue that, had the cardinals rather than the pope proposed Morone’s appointment, one might have suspected that it sprang from “malice” or from the intention “to endanger his life through the hardships of the journey in these difficult times, or his reputation and authority; for the affair is truly of such a nature that a man of his standing, who has brought so many others to a successful conclusion, can gain little by guiding it toward the peace desired, while he can lose much if by chance it takes a bad turn” 32. A few days later, on 23 March, while reporting that the secret instruction given to the cardinal was “to preserve that city and republic in its devotion to Spain, as it has been until now,” he added that the shrewder courtiers believed Morone “will accomplish very little by this journey, since civil wars are the most difficult to settle” 33.

Even before reaching Genoa, indeed, the legate himself did not conceal his impression that matters were now “beyond hope of settlement” 34. On the day of his departure from Rome, 23 March, “accompanied by many Roman nobles and many prelates of the court” 35, with the task “of quieting and pacifying that republic, because the pope does not desire disturbances in Italy,” Don Juan de Zúñiga insisted on meeting him to commend the pro-Spanish party in Genoa to his care, also to prevent the contagion from spreading to Naples and Milan, and received ample assurances from him 36. No doubt also wishing to obtain firsthand information about Genoese events, the grand duke of Florence had already invited Morone, while he was traveling from Rome toward Liguria at the end of March, to stay in Siena. The legate accepted these attentions with his customary impatience toward official ceremony and his concern that it might delay him, finally agreeing to perform “the ceremony of entry” into Florence as simply as possible 37.

The whole journey became an occasion for diplomatic work. Everywhere greeted with signs of esteem, including those of Duke Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy 38, he met the ambassador of the duke of Ferrara, the prince of Massa, and representatives of the government of Lucca, promptly informing the pope of “the great kindnesses shown me by the grand duke of Florence as far as his frontiers, and the no lesser courtesies extended to me by this republic” 39. Of particular interest was his meeting with Paul de Foix, held in early April at Torrenieri, outside Siena. A French churchman and diplomat whom the Parlement of Paris had arrested in 1559 because of his opposition to the Edict of Compiègne, which prescribed severe punishments for heretics, after being cleared he had entered the privy council of Charles IX, then been appointed ambassador to Venice and finally conducted diplomatic activity in England. Pius V, who regarded him as a

heretic, had opposed his appointment as French ambassador in Rome, but since 1574 he had resided in the city as representative of the future Henry III, then still king of Poland. His candidacy for the archbishopric of Toulouse was likewise obstructed by suspicions of heterodoxy, which made him unwelcome even to Gregory XIII 40. One can therefore imagine the caution with which Morone received him, not only because of the religious suspicions surrounding him but also because of the disputes then dividing France and the Holy See over the thorny question of the crown's periodic sequestration of ecclesiastical property 41. Meanwhile Philip II was planning to send the marquis of Los Vélez to Genoa 42. He was later replaced by Carlos Borja y de Castro, fifth duke of Gandía, who did not arrive in the city until 13 August and who would work beside the Spanish ambassador Juan de Idiáquez, present there since 1573 43, in close cooperation with the apostolic legate.

Morone was received with full honors on 16 April (plate 8), after traveling by litter as far as La Spezia and then being carried to Genoa aboard a galley 44, and immediately informed Philip II that his mission had begun. The king of Spain was then under pressure from the revolt in the Netherlands, which helped relegate the Genoese uprising to a secondary place in his concerns 45. A few days earlier, on 8 April, someone had nevertheless written to him from Rome describing the dreadful climate prevailing in Genoa: "Ambition and ignorance together have brought insolence and madness there; discord, hatred; resentment, poison; fury, arms; usury, guilt; and the judgment of God, punishment. Let the legate therefore hasten there as much as he can"—the writer concluded—"for, being unaccustomed to these humors, […] it is believed that he will accomplish little, although many expect much of him" 46. Morone's initial optimism was therefore short-lived. "We are laboring greatly here, but I still do not see with what result, unless perhaps the minds of all parties should come to place somewhat greater confidence in me, through which they might better receive my exhortations and efforts," he wrote on 22 April, presenting Rome with a desolate picture of the situation in Genoa. There the "Senate, which they call the Colleges together with the doge, is not only extremely weak but so divided that, since they themselves are the origin and source of all the evils of this city, nothing useful for the government of the republic can be extracted from them except with the greatest difficulty"; there "criminal and civil justice is not exercised in any respect"; and there "the people are so numerous, armed, and united that everything is alarming, since at the slightest signal from seditious persons they rise and riot and can do great harm" 47.

A week later the cardinal bitterly observed that "the deeper one goes, the greater the difficulty and obstruction one encounters, especially because anyone who aims—as I do—to reach the substance of a settlement never lacks occasions for obstacles to be placed in his path, since each of these factional men has, because of his own interests and passions, purposes different from mine, and thus opposition repeatedly arises among us" 48. His entourage also included Paolo Odescalchi, bishop of Como, an able and experienced diplomat 49, who was compelled to note with grave concern that in Genoa at that moment "justice is not administered; everyone carries an arquebus, sword, and dagger; nothing is heard but 'To arms! To arms!'; nothing is seen but quarrels and drawn swords on every corner," as he wrote to the duke of Mantua on 17 April 50. He added the following in a letter to Gallio on 13 May 51:

> From the beginning, […] ever since the Most Illustrious Lord Cardinal Morone arrived as legate in this city, I have always feared that just as at his coming they sang *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini*, so at his departure they might cry *Crucifige, crucifige eum*. The malignity of the humors of these New Nobles and the obstinacy with which they persist in their sickness have brought us very close to that point.

That same day Morone informed Rome that he regarded armed intervention by Philip II as unlikely, "since he has so many undertakings in hand and has incurred so many expenses in the past, and because by nature he seeks rather to preserve his own states than to occupy those of others." He certainly would not be the man to "disturb the peace" enjoyed in Italy and therefore "would be very glad if the affair were settled," also because he knew that "when arms are involved religion is corrupted, and if matters are placed in the hands of soldiers there is a danger that heresies will increase wherever there are wars and license to say and do whatever one pleases" 52. In this situation of grave crisis, the legate's arrival immediately marked a significant turning point. Above all, he became the principal interlocutor of the various parties, including the Signoria itself, which appointed a commission to conduct negotiations, six Old Nobles and six New. At their

first meeting with Morone, the New Nobles presented a memorandum that essentially echoed Senarega's speech, through a delegation whose social composition was so varied that Odescalchi remarked that "it seemed lawful for everyone, great and small, rich and poor, noble and ignoble, to discuss the government of the republic" 53. The two prelates' first impression was of a society stripped of all control, plunged into anarchy, and at the same time resistant to every possible agreement. For this reason on 4 May Morone expressed all his pessimism to the cardinal of Como 54:

> So little stability does this city possess in embracing what is good, and so great is its obstinacy and tenacity in carrying out its own will, that although some little light sometimes appears, the smallest thing extinguishes it; and conversely no argument, nor even the most evident danger of total ruin, can enter the minds of either party, which seem to find their satisfaction in contradicting and persecuting one another. […] *Surdis fabulam canimus*, and although they appear somewhat moved at the moment, they always return to their usual ways. I therefore see little remedy, and I have told them several times that Our Lord, out of the paternal charity he bears toward this city and to fulfill his office as true shepherd, has sent me here despite the great burden of my age, my health, the long and difficult journey, and the weather; and that when I have patiently exhorted and begged them to take the road of peace and submit to reason, if my persuasions find no place, *excutiam pulverem de pedibus meis*, according to the command of our Savior, and I shall always bear witness wherever necessary to their obstinate passion.

Nor was this lucid judgment altered by the flood of projects, proposals, and memoranda arriving from every direction, most of them impossible to accept. One text presented to the cardinal suggested, for example, "that for crimes of *laesa maiestas*, assassinations, and other atrocious cases, offenders may be seized in any place, and especially in churches, and that judgment as to whether cases are atrocious or not should belong to the Senate alone when it issues a warrant for arrest in a church" 55. From this it can be inferred how Morone, newly arrived in Genoa and tormented by gout, after repeatedly exhorting the Old Nobles to return and the delegations that appeared before him in an unending stream to concord—often contradicting and disavowing one another—also had to concern himself with preserving order in the city 56. The highest offices and the very structure of government in the Dominante seemed to have dissolved, and it is therefore unsurprising that he was distressed by the fear of a further deterioration that would make the situation wholly ungovernable. "We are in great agitation, since the people have now resolved that they wish to take part in the government, something they seemed not to care about at first." Criminal and civil justice continued to be abandoned, agreement could not be reached even on a ban on carrying arms, and over everything hung the danger that the New Nobles might join forces with the dispossessed, worsening the city's already chaotic disorder. "I am trying to win over some leaders of the people so as to remove them from the union and hands of certain seditious New Nobles," he wrote in early May, when the strategy by which he hoped to escape that labyrinth was beginning to take shape: asking the Senate for tax relief and the abolition of the duty on retail wine sales 57.

In this poisoned atmosphere, in that tangle of rivalries, hatreds, and mutual vetoes in which everything seemed to go "from bad to worse" 58, for several weeks he had to walk a very narrow path, with almost no room for maneuver. He tried to soften political and social conflict, to do everything possible to contain the often instrumental impulses toward street violence, to seek a path of mediation that at first appeared destined to certain failure, and to preserve the conciliatory attitude that had proved so valuable to him in the past. On 8 May he informed Gallio that while he was in bed, "afflicted by poor health," a large delegation had come to tell him "that they wanted no law other than that of 1528," complaining that "countless low commoners had gathered in the cathedral church and had resolved that they too should be called *cives*, and that I should place no faith in them because they were persons of the lowest condition who had nothing to lose, and similar things," threatening to massacre them 59.

> I begged them to leave the poor fellows alone and not to prevent them from having access to me—Morone continued—so that, as a public person, I might hear them, […] and I told them that I had no other purpose than, if possible, to restore peace to this republic. I took down the names of all these men and others, noting what they told me. Then six deputies from that popular multitude came, and with tears in their eyes they gave me a memorandum. […] When these poor fellows left my house, as I understand it, they

were surrounded by many other citizens who sought to mislead them; but as they boldly stated their case, they were turned in the direction of the palace of the Signoria while still speaking.

A week later it was said in Rome that he had asked to return, "otherwise he would be compelled to withdraw to Milan, recognizing that he could accomplish little in this legation" 60. For the moment, the only practicable course appeared to be to keep negotiations alive, for fear that an interruption might erupt into open civil violence 61. Meanwhile, to the weight of diplomatic activity was added the burden of concluding other institutional and personal affairs. The cardinal, for example, personally followed the case of several Swiss from the canton of Bern, who proved to have come "to offer military service and not to perform a public office." He warned the authorities of the Dominante of the dangers involved in receiving "such people, deeply infected with heresy," and reported their presence to the Dominican inquisitor, who questioned those with whom they had come into contact 62. The legate used the dispatch of the proceedings against the Bernese to Rome as an opportunity to press for the appointment of an inquisitor, who until then had been chosen by the local superiors of the order 63. During those weeks he also fulfilled his role as protector of English Catholics, forwarding to Gallio a letter from several of them "recently driven from Flanders," with a request that the pope "favor them, for they are truly deserving of compassion" 64. He attended to the assignment of vacant benefices in Modena and in the district of Lodi, his maternal family's land of origin, concerning which his ever-diligent sister Anna kept him informed 65. Finally, he lost no opportunity to urge that "the good Theatine fathers of San Silvestro, exemplary in life and conduct for this city," be established in a Genoese abbey occupied by "certain unfrocked friars and very unruly priests" 66.

Meanwhile the New Nobles had gathered broad powers and interests around themselves. The corporate, psychological, and symbolic dimensions of the struggle—the competition for kinship alliances, prestige, and display—were by no means a secondary premise of the conflict, as the legate soon understood 67:

> The Old Nobles held the New Nobles in no account, either in marriage alliances, social intercourse, deeds, or words; rather, they showed themselves haughty and contemptuous and called them shameful names on every occasion. Because of the envy aroused in them by the magnificent palaces, the estates purchased, and the great wealth and backing of the New Nobles, [the latter] began two years ago to form the conspiracy that has now come to light. […] These New Nobles have been exceedingly diligent and prudent in uniting themselves, drawing the people to their side, and binding them all together with a remarkable gathering of every class of men. […] They have the armed populace, the consuls of the guilds, the captains and soldiers, the merchants, the lawyers, the physicians, the nobles of the five popular houses, and organized councils that remain constantly vigilant, […] providing for the needs of craftsmen and supplying money not only for the public cause but also for private individuals. […] They have the support of male and female religious, secular and regular, and everyone, according to his or her condition, works continually and promptly in this undertaking.

3. "Matters Are Growing Worse and the Parties More Embittered"

One initial result achieved by Morone was an agreement between the New and Old Nobles—who had gone so far as to invoke Spanish intervention *manu militari*—on the "unity and equality of the nobles." Once everyone had accepted "that there should remain a single order of their nobility," as was immediately reported to Rome on 16 May, the next task was to discuss the form of that single order, thereby entering into the substance of the laws of 1528. At the end of the month, however, a countermand arrived from the Old Nobles assembled at Finale, requesting that ministers of Philip II also take part in the negotiations and threatening not to honor their debts at the exchange fair scheduled for late June. Morone had foreseen such a turn: "All [the Old Nobles] intend to take up arms on their own account if the Catholic King permits it," he had written to Rome a few days earlier. In fact, when their representatives Stefano Lercari and Agostino Spinola explained the situation in Madrid, they became convinced that Spanish fears arose chiefly from the risk "that if we begin this war, the noise of arms may arise in Italy, something ill suited to the present state of affairs in the world" 68. It was then that the deadlock in negotiations and the New Nobles' continual agitation led Morone to regard armed conflict as inevitable. Its outcome seemed predictable to him, since the Old Nobles' immense wealth was largely committed in loans to the Spanish crown, as he reported on 23 June 69. On 7 July he wrote to the Catholic King that "matters are growing worse and the parties more

embittered” 70. The exiles’ financial difficulties were common knowledge, as was Philip II’s unwillingness to support their bellicose strategy, and this must have reassured Morone that armed confrontation would not actually occur 71. Yet the negotiations made no progress, and the legate could only complain to Rome of the quagmire in which he found himself, “having in hand a business in which one must deal every day with such a variety of minds that they change from one hour to the next” 72.

“Affairs here continue to fluctuate with the same scant hope of agreement,” he wrote on 29 July to Alessandro Casali, a Bolognese jurist and former inquisitor who had become a trusted associate first of the ambassador in Rome and then of the king of Spain, for whom he undertook delicate diplomatic missions until his appointment as bishop of Vigevano in 1578 73. From Morone’s perspective, which could look beyond the Genoese microcosm, responsibility for the stalemate rested chiefly on the shoulders of the perpetually indecisive *rey prudente*: “Spain’s slowness has greatly harmed this negotiation, because both parties, according to what they say, have always possessed—or at least believed themselves to possess—the goodwill of that court, without its ever reaching any resolution.” No one could doubt “the power of the Catholic King, […] sufficient for an undertaking greater than restraining those citizens who wish to be unruly,” but it was well to bear in mind “what those rebels in France and Flanders who have thrown themselves into desperation have been and remain capable of doing: without money they have raised many armies and brought those countries to ruin.” Hence his incisive political judgment that “without clarity about the king’s mind, one walks in darkness” 74. No less pointed was the remark with which he shortly afterward answered, “laughing,” the Spanish envoy who insisted that a contingent of infantry should be retained in Genoa: “I am a priest, and without an order from the pope I ought not to give opinions on matters of war, least of all to the minister of another prince” 75. When meeting the various Genoese factions, he did not refrain from the occasional “stinging word,” but always sought to “end sweetly, […] reminding them of the honorable exploits of their forefathers in conquering so many lands in Barbary, Syria, the Black Sea, and various other parts of the world, and expressing the hope that their peace might greatly help resistance to the power of the Turks” 76.

Meanwhile, in June the imperial commissioners and Don Luis de Córdoba, sent by Don John of Austria, arrived in Genoa. The cardinal instructed Córdoba to discuss everything with him and obey his orders—“let him do whatever I tell him”—while nevertheless requesting instructions from Rome on how he should conduct himself “in this triumvirate” 77. A month later Henry III’s ambassador, the Milanese Mario Birago, arrived with Giovan Galeazzo Fregoso. They accomplished nothing and soon had to depart, after arousing fears among the nobility that French interference was intended chiefly to incite the people and place the patriciate in difficulty 78. Morone’s plan to draw some of the New Nobles into Philip II’s service had no time to be implemented, because in mid-September the Old Nobles opened hostilities from Finale beneath the standards and banners of the Dominante, appointing Gian Andrea Doria “captain general and absolute governor of this just and holy enterprise.” As could have been expected, the military phase was brief—from September to October 1575—and did not halt Morone’s negotiations, although fear of violence and shortages of provisions led him to consider transferring his household to Tortona 79.

Proposals and counterproposals continued to flow without interruption among Rome—where the pope demanded the immediate cessation of armed clashes—Genoa, and Finale. Once again Morone had to display patience and diplomatic skill while waiting for tensions to subside, as began to happen in October 80. Agreements to suspend the fighting prepared the way for the election as doge of Prospero Fattinanti Centurione, a New Noble appreciated by the Old, who had already volunteered to act as spokesman for his faction in anticipation of peace talks. This was the indispensable condition for opening negotiations at Casale Monferrato—“to reform the laws with greater safety and convenience,” Morone wrote to Philip II 81—between delegations of the parties, in the presence of ambassadors from several foreign powers and under the mediation of the papal legate, who was nevertheless portrayed in Spain as a sympathizer of the New Nobles 82.

When discussions began at Casale in November 1575, the Milanese cardinal had accumulated an enormous mass of opinions, proposals, and counterproposals—“he has a whole bag full of these schemes,”

Odescalchi observed—collected and classified with scrupulous care. Even during the days of war he continued to work tenaciously for peace. “Together with my lord colleagues, I do not fail to recover whatever good can be obtained and to devise models and settlements,” he wrote to Guglielmo Gonzaga 83. The vast documentation on those negotiations preserved in the archives is itself testimony to his exhausting work of mediation, embodied in an impressive accumulation of memoranda, “articles,” “capitulations,” “discourses,” “distinctions,” “recommendations,” “remedies,” “examples,” lists of candidates or persons eligible for office, “points,” “considerations,” “warnings,” opinions and “dissenting opinions,” projects, provisions, and amendments. This immense quantity of papers, often annotated in the cardinal’s own hand, tangibly expresses his effort to transplant into politics and institutional reform the irenic approach that had always characterized his activity 84. Nor was his daily commitment diminished by the grave bereavement that struck him at the beginning of November 1575 with the death of his faithful friend and secretary Filippo Gheri. “Your Most Illustrious Lordship can imagine how great is the sorrow I feel, in addition to the assistance he would have given to the cause, which he understood very well; yet he died with such religion, having received all the necessary sacraments, that this has greatly consoled me,” he wrote to Gallio on 4 November, asking Rome to confirm his authorization for the hereditary transfer of several of Gheri’s benefices 85—naturally in defiance of the Tridentine decrees he himself had caused to be approved. The following day he informed Alessandro Casali, taking care to tell him that the death had occurred “religiously, after he had received all the sacraments and put his affairs in order” 86.

The material examined at Casale consisted not only of projects for reforming the Genoese constitution advanced by the protagonists of the conflict, but also of opinions commissioned by Morone from theologians in his entourage and from jurists designated by the Old Nobles and the Spaniards, some of whom moved to the Gonzaga stronghold. This abundance of advisers—revealing of the habit of careful deliberation with which the cardinal treated the most delicate matters—slowed the negotiations. “Your Most Illustrious Lordship should know that I have never had in my hands a business more intricate than this,” he wrote to Gallio from Casale on 15 November, rejoicing at the election of Rudolf of Habsburg as king of the Romans, “which should certainly be pleasing to all Christendom, since he is a prince brought up as a Catholic in Spain” 87. The Old Nobles complained, accusing the cardinal of treating “this affair of state in theological terms,” as Giovan Battista Lercari wrote. “Would to God […] that the legate had never come to Genoa,” the Old Nobles complained to Philip II, while Gallio too reminded Morone that “His Holiness does not know why one proceeds by such a path, since this is a matter of state. […] It is not a business for theologians or canonists, but solely for statesmen” 88. Yet Morone remained firmly convinced, as he had written to Gallio at the end of August, that “among these Genoese gentlemen there is little knowledge of theology and law, and unless they have someone to guide them well, they always err in such matters” 89.

The provisions drawn up at Casale did in fact include interventions on religious questions, above all those connected with Genoa’s distinctive position as a world center of finance, where the substance of Catholic teaching on exchange transactions and usury was disregarded. The issue had been raised with renewed force in Rome in 1573, at a meeting of theologians called to discuss Pius V’s feared bull *Cum onus*. By condemning the extremely widespread instrument of the personal census—so called because it was secured not upon the debtor’s real property, as was the “real” census, but upon the personal solvency of the debtor and his heirs—the bull had in practice remained unenforced 90. On that occasion an anonymous *Dialogue in Which Exchange Transactions and Other Contracts for Merchandise Are Discussed* was published in Genoa, defending the so-called “dry” exchange, which was not to be confused with usury “because it is not conducted between the poor and needy, but between wealthy persons and by choice.” Within the same debate there circulated a short treatise *On Exchange Transactions* by Matteo Palescandolo, a regular cleric who from 1575 played a decisive part in the affairs of the Genoese Theatine house 91. The Casale negotiations also addressed the delicate subject of the guilds, connected with that of usury. It was agreed that all occupations conducted from an open shop, involving retail sales or manual labor, should be regarded as mechanical, as should the work of all notaries and chancery clerks, except attorneys enrolled in the College, and that of silk artisans. For this purpose Morone had the New Nobles provide him with a list of Old Nobles who had practiced the occupations under discussion, always seeking a compromise “so that it may be

recognized that there is not so great a difference of nobility among all the citizens […] as some of those outside presume." On that occasion the New Nobles objected to the exclusion of "Tuscan dealers" and notaries—"occupations formerly always held in high esteem"—who ran no risk of "descending into an occupation less lawful, as perhaps the exchange business is" 92.

On the two issues of usury and the guilds, obviously crucial in the context of the Dominante, the effectiveness of Morone's method and his habit of requesting expert opinions emerge clearly. One such consultation, whose author is unknown, examined the links between exchange transactions and the guilds; Morone then incorporated its proposal when the technical text of the laws was drafted. The adviser recommended that neither exchange dealings nor loans to governments be expressly named among the permitted occupations. Yet the evident impossibility of declaring such work mechanical "because of the large number of nobles engaged in it" made it advisable "to include them by name among the other occupations permitted to the Genoese nobility, with the proviso, however, that they conduct them lawfully." It was a useful expedient, but one that offended the legate's sensibilities. Although on Christmas Eve he had already informed Philip II that an agreement had been reached "for the peace of Italy and all Christendom" 93, in January 1576 he was still expressing doubts in Rome: "There remains an important difficulty in admitting tax farmers, customs contractors, and bankers into the nobility." Even while the articles of law were being drafted, he communicated his misgivings to the pontiff, but concluded that it was necessary "to take the good when the better cannot be had," reiterating forty years later the same principles and orientations he had expressed during his nunciatures in German lands 94:

> The difficulties encountered over the decree concerning exchange dealings have caused us great trouble […], and although, because of the opposition we have met from the Catholic lords—who have mingled with it the interest and service of the king and his ministers—we have not been able to obtain what I most desired, namely to abolish entirely this evil and most perverse practice of usury by depriving its practitioners even of nobility, nevertheless everything has been settled, with the opinion of these prelates and our doctors, by taking the good when the better cannot be had.

4. The Resolution of the Crisis

The Casale negotiations can be followed day by day thanks to the abundance of the surviving, though incomplete, documentation, but this is not the place to retrace their course. It is instead worth pausing briefly over the outcome of the crisis and especially over the working method Morone adopted to create the conditions for constructive discussion. The results were regularly sent to Gregory XIII in response to his meticulous desire "to understand in detail the whole thread of the business as it is woven, not only those matters that will be discussed with the participation of the parties, but much more the others that will be treated and settled privately, without their knowledge" 95. As a rule, the negotiations involved the legate first consulting the foreign ambassadors and then preparing outlines of the questions to be discussed. He would then summon the two delegations of Genoese nobles to hear their opinions and, after dismissing them, resume consideration of the problems with the diplomats assisting him.

The first topic discussed was justice, concerning which Matteo Senarega—"very eloquent, in the Genoese manner" 96—maintained an extensive correspondence with Morone 97. The legate repeatedly expressed to Gallio and to the nuncio in Spain, Niccolò Ormanetto, his alarm over the state of justice in Genoa, stressing the anomaly of a judicial apparatus that ought to be independent but was in fact controlled by the Senate and thus by the New Nobles 98. Because of its crucial importance, this subject continued to be discussed on the margins of meetings devoted to other problems, "so as to have it ready at the time of the decision," Morone wrote on 22 November. The second group of questions addressed in the negotiations concerned government and nobility. These too were always presented to the two delegations through a summary prepared by the cardinal and his collaborators, listing the unresolved issues. The subject was examined from the outset on the basis of two non-negotiable principles. Morone had established the first at the beginning of his legation as a point on which he would not compromise: "A single order should be made of the citizens who are to take part in the government of the republic, all of whom […] are to be understood as nobles," thereby eliminating every designation of *portico* and faction. The second principle concerned the admission of jurists to

government. “It seems most absurd,” he stated, “that although Genoa possesses a College of most eminent doctors, they are never employed in the government of the republic. Consideration should therefore be given to whether several doctors ought to be appointed or placed in all the Colleges as officials or assessors” 99.

Proceeding from these premises and by this method, discussions continued intensively at separate tables for each subject. “They do not cease […] holding meetings every day,” wrote an agent of the duke of Savoy, while the king of Spain sent a secretary to Naples to confer with Doria and Don John of Austria, who in turn consulted Granvelle, then in Rome. The progress of the negotiations was therefore anything but simple. The Spaniards immediately displayed considerable suspicion and rigidity, while for some time the two Genoese factions merely repeated their original positions. The New Nobles appealed to the merits of the laws of 1528, proposing only minor adjustments and requesting as their sole reform that the *alberghi* be converted into parishes among which noble citizens would be distributed by lot. The Old Nobles, by contrast, reaffirmed the model of eight seats—four for the Old and four for the New—appointed separately by the Colleges and Councils with a two-thirds majority, the same majority required for the Colleges and Minor Council to approve laws 100. Morone’s far from easy task was to find a middle ground between these demands.

A long letter he sent to the curia on 9 September almost allows us to hear his voice and follow his persuasive action on a single issue. The legate wrote it at a moment of discouragement, when negotiations had broken down after prolonged efforts to reach agreement on the crucial question of granting the legate and the other foreign ambassadors the *balía*, that is, extraordinary legislative power. With his customary diplomatic skill and rhetorical effectiveness, Morone demonstrated through rigorous logical argument, reference to the existing laws, and appeal to agreements already reached that the objections raised and the demands presented to him were unfounded and arbitrary 101. To the three reasons invoked by the Genoese against the *balía*—“that they have sworn to observe their laws, […] that they lack authority to grant the said *balía*, […] that the people do not consent”—the legate replied “at length to them all,” point by point. On the first issue he analyzed the internal and international institutional and political balances involving kings, emperors, and pontiffs, not without describing the pope as the “supreme prince.” On the second he observed “that if this were so, they should have thought of it when they offered it.” On the third Morone adopted emphatic tones in indicting some of the less noble features of the political and social relationships on which the Dominante’s internal balances rested: the unscrupulous use of propaganda among the humbler classes “with so many lies that it is beyond belief,” and recourse to corruption. The cardinal followed this “argument” by producing evidence, “showing that the falsehood was not ours but belonged to those who attributed it to us.” He concluded with an appeal to their patriotism, their religious faith, and respect for the principles they had pledged to observe in restoring peace, but formally announced that he had done all in his power and that “if they did not resolve to trust us more than this, it was impossible to negotiate with them.” He would at once inform the pope, who was certainly not prepared to accept “that their civil troubles […] should also become trouble for religion.”

Morone addressed the central question by comparing three models of republican government he had prepared and shared with the imperial commissioner, Pietro Fauno, bishop of Acqui, and the Spanish ambassadors. The legate centered his proposal on the problem of the nobility, which was the crucial issue at the origin of the crisis. He reaffirmed the principle of a single order and accepted that the *Liber civilitatis* should be revised, excluding or suspending those who had been enrolled unlawfully or practiced mechanical trades, though exempting those who had held government office. He further provided that in future, in addition to the usual qualifications, newly ennobled citizens should possess “thirty thousand lire in real property and other goods up to a total value of 15,000 scudi,” and finally that the problems surrounding the distribution of magistracies would easily be resolved “once the nobility has in this manner been purified […] and ordered and a single body of the republic has been formed.” On this point, however, the cardinal met open Spanish opposition. The Spaniards wanted the entire Genoese nobility divided into twelve parishes, half Old and half New, with “those citizens who are in excess in the Portico of San Pietro” judiciously transferred into the six parishes of the Old Nobles. Morone’s notes on the document are highly revealing, translating his proposals into lucid political reflection. “Division into parishes in this fashion: perpetual division,” he wrote,

for example, and “unless it were done by lot, a certain and manifest division would remain.” When the imperial representative instead proposed that elections to both Councils and government offices be held on a parish basis, the legate commented: “New discord with the common people; suitable men might not be found in one parish.” Beside the Spanish proposal for eight seats, he noted that “this model comes from Naples” 102.

Faced with the necessity of finding a way out, the cardinal returned tenaciously to work and formulated a new project, preserved in an autograph draft. In it he reaffirmed the indispensable principle of a single order of nobles, with explicit mention of the inclusion of those engaged in “illicit” exchange dealings, and proposed that the entire nobility, “equal in government,” be divided into twelve parishes established “for the first time by the most illustrious ministers of the three princes.” The problem then shifted to the manner of distribution, as Morone noted on the copy sent to Rome: “There remains the difficulty of the division that is in some fashion being introduced.” Yet the strategy of “taking the good when the better cannot be had” intelligently softened the conflicts over the principal issue in dispute. A plan was devised for an elective Great Council of 600 members and a Minor Council of 150, half elected and half chosen by lot. The former directly appointed the supreme *sindacatori* and selected the doge from a slate of candidates. The difficult point, as Morone’s correspondence reveals, was to provide guarantees to the Old Nobles without establishing the division by law 103.

The decisive breakthrough came on 14 December, when the legate proposed a document effectively entitled *To Extinguish All Factions*. It established a single noble order, with no division into *alberghi* or parishes, thereby meeting the demands of the New Nobles. To provide guarantees to the Old Nobles and Spain, however, it proposed that the ambassadors themselves form the Great and Minor Councils, each composed in equal numbers of Old and New nobles, all at least thirty years old and possessing no less than 40,000 lire in property. They were also to create an electoral purse of 120 persons, half Old and half New, from which twelve governors would be drawn each year, with no alteration of the purse permitted until all had been selected. The proposal, the only one capable of “finding a way out of the labyrinth of so many contradictions,” was accepted by the other ambassadors, and Morone was able to transmit it to the pope on 16 December without concealing his satisfaction 104:

> Although I have not been able entirely to avoid some temporary division, […] I have at least sought to avoid a law of division and to preserve the single order of one sole and equal nobility. I have likewise sought to ensure that for many years the government of the city will be provided with the best and most capable persons who can be found. […] Neither party will ever possess certainty of either an excluding or an affirmative power, because the magistrates will be drawn by lot, yet all will be persons selected for at least ten years.

While awaiting the response of the Signoria and the courts, the cardinal, although tormented by frequent attacks of vertigo and “various pains of the stomach and other kinds” 105, remained far from idle and immediately had drafts of the new laws prepared. The principles on which agreement had been reached now had to be translated into an articulated normative structure providing, as Rodolfo Savelli has explained, “an institutional system in which all were formally equal, there was no room for divisions of ‘order’ or ‘faction,’ and lot and vote coexisted, but which should in reality have permitted a fair and controlled distribution of positions between Old and New, while guaranteeing an administration of justice as independent as possible from noble power.” The many fragments and successive drafts prepared at this stage likewise demonstrate the great attention with which Morone followed every single point in the drafting of the new constitutions. Anticipating possible institutional or jurisdictional objections, the legate commissioned Francesco Beccio, an able jurist and senator of Casale, to demonstrate the legitimacy of the proposal embodied in the capitulations. Significantly, Beccio’s arguments also concluded with the consideration that had induced Gregory XIII to send Morone to Genoa: the need to remedy a situation that was not merely a division *inter paucos privatos*, but a conflict on which depended the balance and peace of the republic, of Italy, “and of all Christendom” 106. Meanwhile the more radical groups continued to meet despite repeated prohibitions, although by then they had lost many of their leaders. At the beginning of 1576 the legate learned of “conventicles and private suppers” being held in the city center “among dissatisfied enrolled and prospective citizens” 107. Yet he

refused to leave Casale, although “all the Genoese, both those inside and those outside” asked him to return to Genoa. The journey was too burdensome for him “because he was old and in poor health,” and he did not wish to give the impression of “conducting the bride to her husband” by being present when the Old Nobles returned, as he wrote at the end of February, by which time he hoped to return to Rome before Easter 108.

The formal presentation to the Colleges of the new laws, issued at Casale on 10 March, had a positive outcome, although it did not fail to provoke further criticism. They were signed and read aloud in the cathedral in the presence of the people on the fourteenth—“I now devote myself continually to praising God for having delivered me from so much trouble,” Morone wrote to Rome the following day 109—and promulgated on the seventeenth. Unlike what had occurred in 1527-28, the *Leges novae* were immediately printed in Genoa and shortly afterward in Milan, between summer and autumn, with explanatory additions clarifying doubtful passages 110. “They have been published today, and therefore the Mass of the Holy Spirit was sung in the cathedral church, where the whole Senate was present; tomorrow the procession will take place, […] and bonfires will be lit for joy,” the republic’s representatives wrote to Senarega, who had not participated in the work but continued to influence it through his emissaries 111.

The spirit of the *Leges novae* of 1528 and 1576 was analogous in expressing the same determination to overcome particularism and faction, tendencies to which Morone’s character and political culture were firmly opposed. Genoa’s recurring crises, including the Fieschi conspiracy of 1547 and the still more explosive conflict of 1575, arose from disputes between Old and New nobles that had never been resolved by their grouping into twenty-eight *alberghi*, a system therefore abandoned. The reforms of that year concerned not only the structure of legislative power but also introduced the novelty of a genuine separation between organs of government and organs of justice, a subject to which, as we have seen, the cardinal had been particularly sensitive during his Bolognese legation 112. Under the new laws, in principle a citizen could no longer be removed from his natural judge, and his right to a formal trial before designated judicial institutions was recognized. The innovation did not last long, however. In September 1576 criminal jurisdiction was immediately restored to the Magistracy of the Poor, the Fathers of the Commune, the Magistracy of Provisions, and the consuls of the Silk Guild. The Colleges themselves obtained the right to try and punish those who maintained armed retainers and went about bearing weapons in defiance of the existing laws 113. Although the establishment of the Civil Rota in 1528, and especially of the Criminal Rota in 1576, tended to rationalize the administration of judicial power, in Genoa—as in many other states of the old regime—it remained one of the most ill-defined spheres in the exercise of power, fragmented among magistracies and local autonomies at different levels. The Senate’s own powers were left somewhat vague.

Morone’s legation and the pacification of the Ligurian republic were already perceived throughout Europe at the time as a fundamental turning point in Genoese and Italian history 114. In February 1576 Odescalchi wrote to the legate that “many are thinking of writing histories of these events,” an undertaking to which a figure of the stature of Giovan Battista Lercari, former doge and one of the leaders of the Deputation of the Old Nobles, immediately devoted himself, followed later by Giovan Battista Spinola 115. The republic derived firmer and more widely shared foundations from the laws of Casale, chiefly through the dismantling of the system of twenty-eight *alberghi*, the end of the forced fusion of surnames, confirmation of the abolition of the *garibetto*, and the restructuring of the Colleges. These changes helped consign to oblivion the claims of distinction theorized by the Old Nobles, although patterns of sociability remained at least partly separate until the eighteenth century 116. As confirmation of the radical discontinuity introduced by the *Leges novae*, after the tragic biennium of 1575-76 Genoese conflicts never again reached the bitterness of the sixteenth century, and later attempts at institutional reform always remained within the framework of the Casale settlement. Even well into the eighteenth century, an authoritative observer such as Joseph-Jérôme de Lalande could remark in his *Voyage en Italie*, published in 1769, that those laws “strengthen the structure of the state, […] regulate the functions of every magistrate, their number, and the duration of their office.” More recent historiography has likewise observed that, thanks to the agreement of Casale, by the end of the eighteenth century the Republic of Genoa had for two centuries been a state that could be described as

“constitutional,” by virtue of written rules “that guaranteed a government in which—at least formally—everything took place precisely by force of law […] and nothing by arbitrary will” 117.

Although it concerned a limited number of problems and was not free of disjointed and cumbersome elements, the text signed by Morone addressed the fundamental political and institutional issues of the old regime: the definition of nobility and its structure of power, its relations with the groups excluded from government, and the procedures and instruments of civil and criminal justice. The first chapter was emblematically entitled *De religione* and established not only the duties of the doge and the Colleges in religious ceremonies, but also the obligations of republican institutions in defending Catholic orthodoxy. It prescribed that the civil authorities must immediately provide the secular arm at the request of the bishop and inquisitor to repress and punish heretics and suspects 118. Hence the rumors spread by “certain seditious and ill-intentioned men,” as Canobio wrote to Morone on 14 March, three days before the promulgation of the laws, who were “sowing evil reports to stir up the people, saying that the new laws intend to introduce an Inquisition, that life is in the hands of the Criminal Rota, which is composed of foreigners, property in the hands of the Civil Rota, likewise composed of foreigners, and that to complete the matter the archbishop and inquisitor have authority to imprison any citizens they please” 119. Two days before the official approval of the laws, moreover, Morone’s thoughts had turned to Philip II, with whom he rejoiced at the result achieved, “since the admission of those who were outside has been fully preserved, and not only preserved but increased, while the customary authority of Your Majesty has been maintained in the manner you desired.” He declared himself proud to “have served the Catholic King in this action” 120.

Yet the “aristocratic constitution” 121 that emerged from Morone’s legation also sanctioned other important principles: affirmation of the political equality of all those “enrolled” in the *Liber civilitatis*; a measure of flexibility in the *Declaratio artium mechanicarum*, that is, compatibility between nobility and entrepreneurial, shipping, financial, commercial—at wholesale—and in part notarial activity, which were regarded as “not derogating” from noble status; and an opening toward non-nobles, some of whom could periodically enter the patriciate through formal procedures. No less important were the provisions governing electoral procedures; the responsibility of all holders of public office, who were subject to review; the possibility that persons not enrolled “in the book of citizenship,” but possessing merit and expertise, might hold important public offices; and the definition of a judicial system composed of professional judges enjoying broad autonomy, although this feature, not itself new to Genoa, was soon contradicted in practice 122.

According to Claudio Costantini, the framers of the constitution of 1576 did not resolve at a fundamental level the alternative between an aristocratic and an oligarchic republic for which the New and Old Nobles respectively had contended. Rather, they “fixed in law [the] disposition favorable to excluding the weak and turbulent, while at the same time attempting to promote broader participation by the others.” Compared with the reformers of 1528, the men gathered at Casale were less attentive to the values of representation and gave priority to selective mechanisms within republican institutions 123. The *Leges novae* nevertheless accustomed the Genoese patriciate as the body of “citizens of government,” as well as the notables of the Domain who administered subject communities and the bourgeoisie of the professions and commerce, positioned beside the patriciate as chancellors, vicars, and lesser judges, to coexist under a body of written rules regulating public life. The capacity of that constitutional edifice not only to establish principles but, above all, to create cultures and practices of orderly civil coexistence would prove so strong that even during the Restoration the Genoese ruling class continued to assert its enduring merits. The *Leges* were then invoked as necessary, albeit in a slightly modernized form, but failed to persuade the powers assembled at the Congress of Vienna, which decreed the annexation of Liguria to the Savoy monarchy 124.

Chapter Twenty-Six

“Long Experience of the Affairs of the World”: The Diet of Regensburg, Poland, and Russia

1. 1576: One Last Time at Regensburg

Closely followed by the courts of Europe, the dramatic events of the Republic of Genoa in 1575 had acquired particular importance for the foreign powers directly involved in them: the Holy See, Spain, and the Empire. For Maximilian II in particular, the assertion of the principle that his commissioners must be present during the drafting of the *Leges* and the peace negotiations had translated—despite the resistance of the Dominante—into a political success. Pietro Fauno, bishop of Acqui and his commissioner on the spot, had written to him from Casale to rejoice that “Your supreme imperial authority has by far revived and doubled throughout Italy; now that Your Majesty is secure with the king of the Romans, the kingdom of Bohemia, and, in addition to your other states, the new acquisition of the kingdom of Poland, it will be easier than before to preserve and increase the position in which you find yourself” 1. These words—spoken by a prelate whom Morone and Maximilian II himself tried unsuccessfully to raise to the cardinalate 2—help remind us that Italian events belonged to a much broader political theater. To understand it, one must also follow Morone’s tireless service to papal diplomacy in the months that followed. As for Spain, whose representatives had viewed his mission with suspicion and at times obstructed it, the ambassador in Rome had to offer the Milanese cardinal some apology for the mistrust shown during his mission to Genoa, assuring him that he had subsequently clarified matters with all the Catholic King’s ministers and that the sovereign had expressed complete satisfaction with Morone’s conduct 3.

Morone’s return to Rome was not easy. Leaving Casale on 21 March for Milan, where he arrived privately that same evening “by coach,” he was immediately besieged by visits and family obligations, without being able to enjoy the quiet he desired 4. Yet by 1 April he was already in Ravenna, from where he expected to reach Rome before Easter, despite the shallows of the Po that made ferrying his baggage difficult. There, however, as he prepared to resume his journey from Pesaro toward Rome, news reached him that Gregory XIII intended to travel to Bologna and wished Morone to await him there, although the pope later changed his mind 5. The legate extricated himself from the inconvenience of having to turn back by pleading the need “to avoid places suspected of plague” and the fact that he had “already sent part of the household and almost all the goods to Rome by different routes.” He continued on his way, while seeking to avoid a public consistory honoring his Genoese success. “There would be no need to burden His Holiness by honoring me and granting me a public consistory,” he wrote to Gallio on 1 April, “because my part was the least, and I hope that Your Most Illustrious Lordship will assist me in this, helping me at the same time to avoid envy and not attribute to me more than the little that is my due” 6.

The legate’s triumphant arrival in Rome on 14 April was nevertheless greeted by the pope’s enthusiastic reception in a public consistory “in commemoration of so celebrated an action,” Gallio informed the nuncio in France, Anton Maria Salviati, “and at the same time to honor the person of His Most Illustrious Lordship, who did no less to bring that affair peacefully to a close than he has done in so many other important actions that have made his worth and prudence known” 7. In Morone’s mind and heart, those celebrations were perhaps clouded by the fact that on that very day Bartolomé Carranza was condemned by the Roman Holy Office to abjure on vehement suspicion of heresy. Upon his return to the city, past and present thus mingled before the eyes of the elderly cardinal, perhaps deepening the discouragement caused by the prospect of immediately having to set out again for Regensburg, where Maximilian II had summoned the Diet of the Empire for May. In order “to remedy as far as possible the assaults of the heretics against Catholics,” Pope Gregory XIII once again resolved to entrust him with the legatine cross, although he had “barely returned from the Genoese legation and needed rest.” The pontiff compelled him to accept because of “the great experience he has of these humors,” as Gallio wrote to Salviati 8.

In addition to supporting Habsburg designs on the Polish throne, the project was once again to forge an alliance between the two branches of the House of Austria and the Holy See against the Turk. For this purpose, “Cardinal Morone carries with him bills for 100,000 gold scudi already paid here to merchants, in addition to the 25,000 already disbursed there by the reverend nuncio, in order with this remedy to give the emperor greater vigor,” the Venetian ambassador wrote on 28 April 1576 9. It was an ambitious project, especially because the delicate dynastic crisis that had just opened in Poland required, according to the Spanish ambassador in Rome, someone equal to the task to discuss it and to repair the perennial breaches on the German front 10:

> Since an affair of such importance had to be handled, His Holiness judged Cardinal Morone particularly suited to it, as a person who, because of his long experience of the affairs of the world and for other reasons as well, was more capable than anyone else. And so […] at Easter he was created legate in a general congregation and received the cross at that same moment; he departed the following Friday, the twenty-seventh, having to drink this chalice of traveling to so distant a country despite his advanced age and his weariness from the Genoese legation, preferring the public good to his own convenience.

Although stressing the significance of the mission in light of relations between Rome and the Empire, the cardinal of Como wrote in similar terms to the nuncio Bartolomeo Porcia. He informed him that “Our Lord, moved by the desire he has for the emperor’s greatness and by the paternal care he has taken of German affairs from the beginning of his pontificate,” had chosen Morone “although, because of his advanced age, some indisposition, and the many labors he had previously endured, most recently in the Genoese legation, he was highly deserving of excuse.” Yet his presence in Germany was so necessary “for various reasons that it could not be more so” 11. Old, weary, and infirm though he was (plate 9), the man remained indispensable. It is not difficult, however, to imagine the lack of enthusiasm with which he faced another long and arduous journey through a Europe whose religious landscape had meanwhile changed profoundly since 1541, when at Regensburg itself he had exerted all his strength beside Contarini to prevent the worsening of religious conflict in Germany.

At the consistory of 23 April 1576, when Gregory XIII expressed his intention of entrusting him with the legatine cross, Morone offered “great resistance to going, finding himself unfit because of old age and exhausted by the labors endured in quieting the disturbances of Genoa.” Yet he could not escape Gregory XIII’s will. The pope was ready to grant him the “forty-six favors he requested,” as well as “a cardinal at his request at the first promotion” should he die during the mission, to give him “two most beautiful litter mules and a palfrey,” and to exhort him “to drink this chalice for the love of God and the service of all Christendom” 12. Pompeo Strozzi reported to the duke of Mantua that the pope had to implore him with tears, lamenting that otherwise he himself would have to travel to Germany. Morone had returned to Rome from Genoa on 14 April; little more than a week later, on the twenty-third, he received the official appointment, and on the twenty-ninth set out, followed by a confident letter from Philip II, who declared himself entirely certain that his “prudence and zeal” would guide events “as is fitting for the service of God” 13. On 21 May he reached Innsbruck, where he remained for several days and asked Peter Canisius to accompany him as confessor 14. On 9 June the emperor received him at Regensburg in a two-hour audience with extraordinary signs of respect, “His Majesty having come to meet him as far as the door of the last room of the palace both on his arrival and on his departure,” accompanied even by three Lutheran princes 15. Three memoranda by Cardinal Ludovico Madruzzo on the political and religious situation of the Empire guided his action 16. He would return to Rome on 16 November, after the death of Maximilian II—some would say “without confession, communion, or holy oil” 17—had frustrated many of the hopes the pope had placed in the mission 18. In light of its many objectives, one can readily understand why the pontiff insisted on securing the dean cardinal’s willingness, for he more than anyone else offered guarantees that the mission would succeed.

Morone’s new German legation in fact pursued a plurality of objectives reflecting the broad range of unresolved political and religious questions, whose implications extended directly or indirectly across the entire continent, from the Iberian Peninsula to Moscow. It has already been noted that in the second half of the sixteenth century the German Empire was proceeding along a kind of double track: on the one hand, the

consolidation of the situation sanctioned by the Peace of Augsburg in 1555, though increasingly stretched to the advantage of Protestants; on the other, the difficulty of enforcing its clauses. By the latter half of the 1570s, the process of defining the confessional boundaries and structures of the Empire's different regions was largely complete in its general outlines. Yet within the various territorial states tensions survived between the dominant faith and those officially proscribed but by no means extinguished. A further problem arose from the German repercussions of the wars of religion unfolding in France and the Netherlands, which were reviving in central Europe the drive toward confessional and military alliances. On the Protestant side these harked back to the memory of Schmalkalden; on the Catholic side they took the form of new "leagues" and "unions" that tempted Gregory XIII himself. On the whole, he was attracted by the idea of an alliance active not only in the Mediterranean but in the heart of Europe, with broad objectives of confessional uniformity that included the recatholicization of England 19.

Relations between Rome and Vienna were complicated by the Turkish question, since the Austrian Habsburgs had always been reluctant to become involved in alliances for fear that they would eventually be left alone to confront so powerful an enemy. Venice's defection in 1573 had confirmed the emperor's apprehensions, and nothing of importance occurred on this front at Regensburg in 1576. Maximilian II's evident intention to request new funds from the Diet for a campaign against the Ottomans had aroused some expectations in Rome. Hopes increased when a Russian embassy arrived in the German city proposing an anti-Turkish alliance with the Empire that might also involve the Holy See, prompting Morone to attempt direct negotiations with Moscow. The immediate occasion was the succession to the Safavid throne and the possibility of war between Persia and the Ottomans, which for a moment appeared to make Philip II less evasive regarding Spanish involvement. "Christendom today could receive no greater benefit from anything than from a vigorous war that might arise between them," Gallio wrote to Morone on 25 August 1576 20. The unfavorable reaction of the German princes, the difficulty of establishing direct relations with Tsar Ivan IV, and the emperor's death on 12 October during the Diet—preceded by weeks of "palpitations of the heart" and "fainting spells," on which Morone sent Rome precise reports 21—nevertheless disappointed Gregory XIII once again. At the beginning of the following year, after news of fresh Turkish preparations, a report circulated that Morone was about to be sent by the pontiff to Spain to discuss the prospect of a new league against the Sublime Porte, but the plan soon came to nothing 22.

Maximilian II had always been lukewarm toward a possible alliance with Rome to contain the spread of the Reformation in Europe, preferring instead irenic policies made still more necessary by the veto that Protestants could exercise in the diets on delicate issues such as taxation. The accession of Rudolf II, educated at the court of the Catholic King, would arouse new hopes in Gregory XIII, since he had occasionally revealed a willingness to defend Roman interests and, immediately after his election, had refused to confirm his father's concessions to the Protestants of Upper Austria. Two years later the new emperor would prohibit Reformed worship in Vienna, winning the praise of Pope Boncompagni 23. What greatly concerned Rome during 1576 and when Morone departed for Regensburg, however, was the prospect that the so-called *Declaratio Ferdinandea*—until then only feared—might be promulgated. Signed in a semi-public form by Ferdinand I on 24 September 1555, it granted, in derogation of the clauses of the Peace of Augsburg, freedom of worship to Lutherans who were subjects of Catholic princes. This was the first ground on which Morone's action at the Diet of Regensburg was tested. He succeeded in preventing promulgation of the declaration 24, in accordance with Philip II's wishes as well 25. On 30 June 1576 the Catholic King also sent the dean a personal letter of good wishes, declaring his full confidence in the "Christian spirit, prudence, and zeal" of that "very dear and much beloved friend" 26, upon whose papal election he had nevertheless maintained a veto for more than fifteen years.

A cluster of interconnected problems had become entangled around the *Declaratio*. The document had only recently been extracted from the archives, where it had lain forgotten for twenty years, when the landgrave of Hesse and the elector of Saxony appealed to it before the emperor, printed it, and circulated it among the Protestants of their territories, thereby arousing the fears of the Catholic princes and the pontiff. On the legal level there immediately confronted one another those on the Protestant side who defended its

validity and those on the Catholic side who challenged it, emphasizing that until 1574 the Protestants themselves had not even known of Ferdinand's pronouncement and that as recently as the Diet of Augsburg in 1566 they had promised to observe the Religious Peace of 1555 without alterations or additions. Moreover, the *Declaratio* had been kept so carefully secret that when it appeared the Protestant princes themselves searched their archives for it in vain and could obtain no copy. Only the imperial chancery preserved a draft, while the elector of Saxony alone possessed the original version because of the special circumstances in which it had been concluded twenty years earlier 27.

The Protestant princes therefore set out for Regensburg hoping to have the *Declaratio* recognized, relying on the fact that the now infirm Maximilian II seemed inclined to make religious concessions in order to secure, while still alive, the succession of his son Rudolf. This could be obstructed above all by Frederick III of the Palatinate, a fervent Calvinist and declared enemy of the Habsburgs. Internal divisions within the Protestant world nevertheless favored Charles V's nephew, and already in November 1575 Rudolf had been crowned at the electoral Diet of Regensburg. On his return journey Maximilian immediately summoned another Diet at the same place for the following year, hoping that it would make it possible to raise the financial resources needed for the struggle against the Turks. In this perspective the Protestant princes again sharpened their weapons, threatening to approve no taxation for war against the Porte unless Ferdinand's *Declaratio* was first accepted. Hence Gregory XIII's conviction that the Diet might prove of crucial importance and his decision to send Morone, for whom even Elector Frederick "the Pious" of the Palatinate felt great esteem and respect 28.

The papal concern to safeguard the Catholic religion stood at the center of the instructions Morone received when departing for Regensburg. Preventing, with the assistance of Catholic princes and bishops, any discussion of the *Declaratio* meant averting the suppression of the so-called *reservatum ecclesiasticum*: the provision attached to the Peace of Augsburg under which ecclesiastical princes who thereafter converted to Protestantism were required to renounce their benefices, dignities, and jurisdictions. During his journey the Milanese cardinal was charged with reaching agreement on this issue with Ferdinand of Tyrol and Albert V of Bavaria, then discussing it with the emperor and forestalling secret concessions to Protestants, while insisting that in such an event the Catholic Church in Germany would be ruined 29. Having left Rome with little enthusiasm, the legate stopped in Florence, Bologna, and Ferrara. From Trent he wrote that he had tried to persuade the Este duke to recognize the Medici dynasty's grand-ducal title granted by Pius V, receiving no answer beyond Alfonso II's continued reference to Francesco I de' Medici as the "duke of Florence" 30. During a stop at Innsbruck he discussed the customary jurisdictional problems with Archduke Ferdinand: "This prince shows himself most fervent in the Catholic religion, but he complained of receiving little assistance from the clergy and the bishops, who, while disputing over jurisdiction, allow all the crimes of priests to go unpunished," he wrote to Rome 31. At the Bavarian town of Landshut, which seemed to him an unexpected exception because of the inhabitants' devotion and the large attendance at Catholic services, he met the future William V of Wittelsbach, the duke's son and successor, together with his brother. He could not, however, be received by Albert, who had gone away "to take the waters" and excused himself from attending the Diet of Regensburg before mid-August 32.

At that point Morone learned that Maximilian would arrive late at Regensburg, where he was also expected to persuade him to form a new league with the Holy See—a prospect about which he would remain optimistic as late as August 33. So as not to enter the city before the emperor, a decision praised by the pope 34, he stopped three miles outside the walls at Eckmühl. Hostility toward Catholics made it difficult for him to find lodging there and led him to observe that the town was "almost entirely Lutheran," the diocese "very badly governed," the bishop "incapable of providing any good example, […] the secular clergy utterly corrupt, and the regular clergy intolerable" 35. The place of assembly was exceedingly crowded. Learning that the Protestant advisers already present, pressed by representatives of Hesse and the Palatinate, were seeking even before the Diet opened to agree on a common memorandum, the legate understood that he in turn must become a political and ideological center of cohesion for the Catholic party. Yet he did not conceal the fragility of an agreement among parties moved by very different purposes and interests. In a letter to

Gallio of 25 May he described the Catholic princely advisers and even the representatives of the Catholic electors as possessing “as much unity as a broom with its twigs untied; they wish to enjoy life, whatever may happen to the world, and many of them are not even firm in the faith” 36. As late as 13 July he would write to Rome that he suspected “these German prelates may have an understanding with the Protestants and seek to make a complete separation from the Apostolic See, because I see them very cold and little observant in matters concerning that See. Some great men have been heard to say that the pope does not understand Germany’s needs and that it is better for them to act on their own” 37. The following day a report from Regensburg stated that “affairs here are not going very well,” although “the Most Illustrious Legate and the whole Catholic band are vigorously resisting, so that there should be no occasion to discuss religion, since for every one person the legate has in his favor there are a hundred against him” 38.

2. “His Beatitude Has Thanked the Lord God a Thousand Times for Having Sent the Legate”

Despite these unpromising premises, Morone’s customary strategic and diplomatic solidity, his incomparable knowledge of German political and religious problems, his reputation, and his affability won broad favor. In spite of his ailments, the legate moved with consummate skill through the round of convivial gatherings. “If my health allowed me to take an even fuller part in their banquets, as I have begun to do, it would be easier for me to win them over,” he wrote to Rome on 19 June, referring to the more reluctant members of the Catholic party 39. That same day he added: “I entertain all these Catholics as best I can with kind words and by courteously granting them such favors as lie within my powers; and if my health allowed me to continue, as I have begun, to associate familiarly with them at banquets, they would be more easily won over. But since I am in poor condition, I do not know how long I shall be able to continue courting them by this means, which is most pleasing to them” 40. If it could serve the cause, in other words, one could and must endure sitting for hours at sumptuous tables, even at the cost of one’s health. Indirect testimony to Morone’s great authority is provided by the subtle hostility with which the Protestant side received that “thin, rather tall man,” with a “white beard,” wearing a “crimson-red mantle and skullcap,” who despite his advanced age crossed the Alps 41. Frederick of the Palatinate himself described him as “a shrewd and experienced head, almost made for those negotiations” 42.

His prestige reached its height when the emperor welcomed him with expressions of exultation. Although paralysis prevented Maximilian from going out to meet the cardinal, he conspicuously had himself carried toward him as far as the vicinity of the stairs and extended his hand to Morone’s entire entourage. In his private cabinet he seated him on a chair almost identical to his own, as observers immediately noted, and spoke to him throughout with affability, listening with great attention to his opinions on the Ottoman and Polish questions. The emperor also expressed dissatisfaction with the condition of the Catholic religion in his dominions, observing that the chief cause of its decline lay in the bishops’ neglect of pastoral care, since they devoted more time to temporal affairs than to spiritual obligations. Giovanni Dolfin, the nuncio present at the audience, immediately wrote to Rome that if there was any man “capable of doing good in Germany, it can only be Morone and no other; not only the emperor, but the entire court is full of his praises” 43. Yet the cardinal had to discuss the most delicate questions with the Habsburg in Dolfin’s absence, because Rome had so ordered him—perhaps because the nuncio was Venetian—in a ciphered letter that once again reveals his irreplaceable role at the imperial court 44. Morone’s preeminence was equally clear in liturgical ceremonial. Despite discomfort and illness, before the principal reigning houses of Europe the legate maintained the composure and humility that had always distinguished his public appearances, without ever diminishing his rank. Nuncio Dolfin reported this to Rome on 29 June 1576 in describing the Corpus Christi procession, “very well attended and devout, but longer and more tiring than was necessary for the legs of His Most Illustrious Lordship.” What sustained his body, however, had been “the courage and vigor of his spirit,” for he went throughout bareheaded with a torch in his hand, “to the great edification of Catholics and even the admiration of heretics” 45.

At the first meeting between Morone and the Habsburg, the legate touched on almost all the subjects Rome had indicated before his departure. First came Polish affairs, in discussing which he expressed the pope's willingness to support Maximilian's plan to assume the crown 46. The emperor nevertheless declared "in a long discourse" that his intention was not principally to obtain the kingdom for himself or his son, "but solely because of the danger that the Turk might establish a foothold there directly or indirectly, and for the preservation of religion." The establishment in Poland of "the Transylvanian"—that is, Stephen Báthory—was regarded by the emperor as "most dangerous," because "it is not known what his religion is" and because of the influence the Ottoman Empire might exercise over him, with the fear that the kingdom might definitively open the gate of Hungary and Germany itself to the Sublime Porte. When the Catholic anti-Turkish league was discussed, the Habsburg once again showed himself cold, "knowing the humors of the king of Spain and his council and likewise fearing the Venetians; and the outcome had clearly shown"—Maximilian added, referring to events after Lepanto—"that it was not well for him to enter it and then be left alone in the lion's mouth." Morone then turned the discussion to the situation in the Netherlands, exhorting the emperor, on the pope's instructions, not to act "against King Philip," and finally to the religious balances of the impending Diet. "I showed that I had no great fear of this Diet," the legate added in his report to the curia, "provided that His Majesty favors our cause." Despite the emperor's "fair words," he concluded in summarizing his impressions of the three principal questions, "we cannot hope for much from affairs here, because of the great difficulties that can be felt with one's hand in the matters of the Turk and Poland, and in the religion of this province" 47.

Meanwhile his presence in Regensburg prompted the rulers of Europe to indulge in various suppositions. Catherine de' Medici conveyed to the pope her resentment over the cardinal's dispatch to Germany, "complaining" that she had not been informed of the legation and declaring herself aware "that he had been sent to assist the emperor in the election and coronation of the kingdom of Poland," to the detriment of her son Henry III, who still considered himself the legitimate sovereign although he had ascended the French throne after his brother's death 48. From that point Rome sent Paris detailed reports on the legate's activity in Regensburg, emphasizing how decisive the pontiff considered his mission for the fate of Catholicism and how news from Germany should reassure the French rulers that the legation was strictly religious in character. "For immense troubles and difficulties are now arising over the interests of religion, on account of which His Beatitude has thanked the Lord God a thousand times for having sent the legate" 49.

When the Diet opened on 25 June, Maximilian II's inaugural address contained no reference to the Empire's religious questions, which in any case were not on the agenda. This sign led the advisers of the Protestant electors to draft a petition, accepted by all, demanding promulgation of the *Declaratio Ferdinandea* and subordinating every other act to it, including the grant of the *Pfennig* for the Turkish war. Morone presented the emperor with an opposing memorandum, relying on the statement submitted by Salentin VII of Isenburg, elector and archbishop of Cologne, the energetic leader of the Catholic party, although Morone himself had reservations about him 50. Having obtained a commitment from the elector of Saxony—the Protestant prince he esteemed most highly 51—not to persist in defending the *Declaratio*, and fearing the emperor's political instability, Morone again appealed through the Spanish envoy to Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol and to Albert of Bavaria. Moved by the cardinal's heartfelt plea, Albert went personally to Maximilian and obtained his assurance that he would never consent to the Protestant demands 52.

Regarding the Empire's confessional division, Morone observed with great acuteness that "this Augsburg Confession is a cover or cloak for all the heresies found in Germany, although they are utterly discordant among themselves," because it alone was recognized beside the Catholic faith. Consequently, "everyone wishes to be included in this confession and under this name not only to maintain themselves in their heresies but also to increase them, as the Calvinists do, whose head is the elector Palatine, although he continually claims to belong to the Augsburg Confession" 53:

> And although they differ in many articles—he continued—they are nevertheless all united against the Apostolic See, and this is a bond that holds them together with less disturbance among themselves, unlike our Catholics, who are divided by various interests and tolerate many excesses by the clergy and the secular

authorities within their states; and the greater part show little affection and devotion toward the Apostolic See.

On 25 August an official declaration was issued at Regensburg confirming that the Peace of Augsburg would continue to be applied under its existing terms. The question of religious concessions to Protestants thus gradually subsided, and after several weeks of negotiation the Diet voted a generous subsidy for the war against the Turks. The sums established on the eve of Maximilian II's death on 12 October would later be disbursed only very slowly to his successor. The emperor's death also served to halt the Protestant response to his assertion that Ferdinand's *Declaratio* ran counter to the need for religious pacification. Taking its principal objective into account, the legation could therefore be regarded as successfully concluded. The "bad news" circulating in Rome at the beginning of October about Morone was without foundation, to the point that people could not "learn whether he was alive or dead" 54, while in reality he was preparing to begin the return journey: "He hopes shortly to set out toward Rome with the greatest satisfaction, all the more because His Majesty has lately made it openly understood that he does not intend to grant the heretics anything beyond the declaration already made" 55. The jurist Minuccio Minucci, who was at Regensburg in the entourage of Nuncio Bartolomeo Porcia, attributed the result to the joint efforts of the archduke of Tyrol and the duke of Bavaria with the emperor, no less than to Morone's "incomparable prudence" 56.

The instructions received by the Milanese cardinal when he went to Regensburg concerned not only "continued and vigorous defense against the Turk" and the "point of religion" raised by the *Declaratio*, but also matters falling within the competence of the German Congregation: the attempt to restore the "churches that are now regarded as almost abandoned," protection of Catholic rites in regions under a bi-confessional regime, the circulation of non-Catholic preachers, and meetings with princes, nuncios, and bishops who could support the legate's action. In addition, those instructions addressed a group of political questions not directly connected with the "intimation," or agenda, of the Diet of Regensburg, but entrusted to the legate's skill and discretion 57. These were matters to be handled alongside "the most important, […] concerning the service of God and religion, namely to remain vigilant that nothing prejudicial to the holy Catholic faith be discussed at the Diet": problems to be examined with discretion and caution, "without showing that this is the principal reason for the legation, but attending to them only as occasion arises from being there" 58.

Morone's latest dispatch to German lands therefore also provided an opportunity to address other affairs considered urgent in Rome, relating to the preservation of the Catholic religion and the application of the Tridentine decrees in German territories. Once again the report on the condition of Catholicism in Germany prepared by Porcia for the legate at Regensburg was despairing. In episcopal elections, "collusions" within cathedral chapters were the rule, designed to prevent the "proper recognitions" due to the Apostolic See. Elections to cathedral canonries likewise disregarded the rules concerning age, required holy orders and dispensations, and the granting of benefices, which were frequently usurped by protégés of princes and nobles. Diocesan synods were not convened; chapters examined candidates for holy orders without episcopal participation; care of ecclesiastical affairs was often delegated to laymen, "and sometimes those men are heretics"; there was a dismal "utter scarcity of theologians and canonists"; residence was little practiced, and canons wore "the dress of knights throughout the time they remained outside choir." Diocesan ordinaries and chapters appeared "very unwilling" to establish seminaries, "although in words they give signs of the contrary." Visitations of dioceses were sporadic, and offices were therefore performed "negligently." Concubinage remained deeply rooted and extreme unction had fallen into disuse. Confessions "are for the most part made in general terms, the parish priests showing themselves annoyed by the necessary enumeration and discussion of sins." Bands of apostate friars wandered through the dioceses. The reading of prohibited books and the presence of married priests were widespread everywhere, especially in Styria and Carinthia but also in the dioceses of Speyer, Bamberg, Würzburg, and Mainz. At the University of Freiburg, which because of the meagerness of salaries could not attract "celebrated professors of scholastic theology," the Index of Prohibited Books had been published by the diocesan synod, but "nevertheless everyone possesses and reads works by heretics as he pleases" 59.

In attempting to change something in this desolate landscape, the legate at Regensburg could rely on able collaborators. Alongside the nuncios and their advisers were the humanist Silvio Antoniano—secretary of the College of Cardinals and author of the speech delivered before the pope during the celebrations for the victory at Lepanto 60—and Peter Canisius himself 61. Nuncio Bartolomeo Porcia also served as Morone's official adviser during the Diet, confirming himself as one of the most authoritative diplomatic figures to emerge in the curia

of Gregory XIII. Boncompagni had met him during a legation to Spain in 1565. Once elected pope, and determined to move beyond Rome's traditional diplomatic structure in its dealings with the Empire - a structure based solely on sending nuncios to the imperial court - he dispatched him in 1573 as nuncio to southern Germany, within the framework of the already mentioned creation of renewed ordinary and extraordinary papal representations in the German lands. His mission was conducted in close coordination with the *congregatio Germanica* and through dialogue with the foremost representatives of Catholicism in those regions: not only Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol and Albert - and later William - of Bavaria, but also the archbishop of Salzburg, Johann Jakob von Kuen-Belasy, and Archduke Charles of Styria. In this setting, the nuncio was chiefly concerned with attempts to reform the education and morals of the secular and regular clergy, the establishment of seminaries for the training of new priests, and the selection of suitable candidates to be sent to study at the German College in Rome. He carried out apostolic visitations and synods, established Catholic printing presses, and supported universities of a confessional orientation 62.

The problems to be addressed, however, were immense, and there was little the legate could accomplish within the brief span of a Diet. Still advised by Porcia, at Regensburg Morone raised with Archduke Ferdinand the question of the University of Freiburg and the heretical books being read there 63, and sent a letter to the clergy of the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg reminding them of the need to apply the provisions of the provincial synod of 1569. This had been the first attempt to establish firm roots for Tridentine reform in German lands, beginning with the region where the bishops' reforming efforts had never entirely ceased and to which the Roman curia could therefore assign a key role in reforming institutions and religious life. As head of the congregation, Morone had followed the matter closely, pressing Porcia tirelessly to put the synodal constitutions into effect 64. Yet, as the papal commissioner in southern Germany, the Dominican Feliciano Ninguarda, never tired of reporting, the religious reform of Austria had so far achieved no appreciable results. Duke Albert V of Bavaria himself was reproached - by Morone among others - for his casual distribution of benefices and appointment of papal envoys, prerogatives that properly belonged to Rome; for obstructing ecclesiastical visitations; and, more generally, for numerous encroachments upon the Church's rights of possession after the death of priests, the levying of taxes for colleges and seminaries, and the buying and selling of ecclesiastical property by civil authorities, sometimes without the knowledge of bishops and religious superiors 65. Porcia and Morone both repeatedly called attention to these abuses, though with little result. After returning to Rome, during a conversation with one of the Wittelsbach's councillors, Morone complained of Bavarian usurpations in ecclesiastical affairs, only to be told in reply that they were caused by the bishops' neglect and the clergy's ignorance, and that without the duke's protection not a single Catholic church would remain in Bavaria 66.

The sixty-four constitutions drafted by the provincial synod of Salzburg in 1569 had been printed after the second synod of 1573 and promulgated by the provincial Diet of 1576. Yet - Morone complained in his letter to the local clergy - nothing had changed among bishops, canons, or the regular and secular clergy, which led him to add his own observations on no fewer than forty-seven points of those provisions 67. Ninguarda's influence is readily discernible in this reprimand. The Dominican from the Valtellina had Milanese roots - his father had served the duchy in the same years as Girolamo Morone - but that was only one possible basis for his understanding with the cardinal legate. After taking part in the final phase of the Council and opposing the concession of the chalice to the laity, Ninguarda had been sent by Pius V as apostolic commissioner to southern Germany, where he had contributed to the success of the provincial synod of Strasbourg and obtained Rome's approval of its decrees. He then continued a wide-ranging campaign to promote reform within the Empire, conducting an apostolic visitation of the convents of the mendicant orders in Bohemia and Austria between 1574 and 1576 and serving as theological adviser to the archbishop of Salzburg, with whom he attended the Diet of Regensburg 68.

Ninguarda periodically sent Rome denunciations of the reception of “heretical preachers” and “apostate monks” in the ruined German convents. He lamented clerical marriage, often supported by laypeople; disregard for the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts; the widespread absence of pastoral care; the failure to administer the sacraments; the abandonment of monastic discipline; and the reading of prohibited texts. He

censured members of the mendicant orders for their scandalous lives, their refusal to wear the habit, their dealings with Protestants, and their obstruction of elections of superiors. With equal insistence he reported nuns' violations of enclosure and their participation in dances, both within and outside convents, as well as in masquerades and hunts. The impossibility of finding laymen to work in kitchens led monks and friars to employ women, to the point that Gregory XIII eventually permitted women of at least forty-six years of age to serve as cooks in convents and monasteries where necessary. The Dominican commissioner likewise had to allow women to enter cloisters, provided they were respectable, elderly, and accompanied 69. All these problems were nearly identical to those Morone had encountered both as nuncio in Germany and as bishop of Modena and Novara. The two prelates' shared pastoral outlook fostered a relationship of esteem and trust that led Morone to recommend Ninguarda to the pope for appointment in February 1577 as bishop of Scala, a suffragan see of Amalfi. Shortly afterward, however, he returned as nuncio to Germany and inherited Porcia's role, while Porcia himself moved to the nunciature established at the court of Rudolf II in Prague 70.

Perhaps Morone's diplomatic strategy, aimed at obtaining from the emperor the strongest possible guarantees for the defense of Catholicism in his lands, lay behind the proposal he sent to Rome from Regensburg that the imperial request to ordain Utraquist priests be accepted. The petition was immediately rejected by the curia, which remained adamant in refusing the possibility of ordaining Utraquist clergy in Bohemia despite requests to that effect made by the archbishop of Prague since the 1560s 71. Finally, among the questions concerning relations between the papacy and German Catholicism that the legate addressed at Regensburg was that of feudal indults. These provided Protestants with a lever, repeatedly deplored by Rome, to gain full admission to the institutions of the Empire by having themselves recognized as administrators of churches that the Roman curia instead regarded them as unlawfully occupying. The original rationale of the indults, which arose from separate agreements with the Apostolic See, was temporarily to substitute for the formal grant of regalian rights in cases - not uncommon - where papal confirmation was delayed for reasons that did not amount to an impediment. In the cumbersome ecclesial situation of Germany, where even episcopal succession in dioceses that remained Catholic was in crisis, the approval of German dignitaries and episcopal consecration were normally delayed both by the slow transmission to Rome of information about the moral qualities of the man elected and by the difficulty of conferring local cathedral prebends, as well as by the shortage of ordinaries and the resulting need for consecration to be performed by a single bishop assisted by two abbots. In the case of the diocese of Würzburg, for example, Morone and Porcia authorized this form of consecration 72. Intended, in view of all these difficulties, to be used for a limited period, normally one or two years, the indults thus gave rise to extensions and renewals that ultimately amounted to approval of indiscriminate grants by the emperors, even for the benefit of Protestants. During the Diet of 1576 Morone tried to address the issue, succeeding in obtaining from Maximilian II a binding promise not to confer regalian rights upon bishops who lacked the necessary qualifications and titles. Instructions sent to the nuncios in Prague in subsequent years referred to that imperial “promise,” but the matter would long remain the subject of inevitable controversy 73.

3. The Polish Succession

The instructions given to Morone when he received the legatine cross also concerned the Turkish question and the Polish succession. He was charged with favoring the Habsburg candidacy 74 and improving relations between the papacy and Russia. The aim was subsequently to send someone “to the Muscovite to negotiate with him and draw him entirely into union with the Roman Church, of which on other occasions he has given us hope,” presenting this initiative to the emperor as useful to his “temporal interests” and especially to the conclusion of the hoped-for anti-Ottoman league 75. To understand the importance of these objectives, one must take account of the political and religious situation in parts of eastern Europe and of the longstanding papal ambitions to establish direct relations with Tsar Ivan IV, the first to assume that title, which the patriarch of Constantinople recognized in 1561, thereby revealing Ivan's imperial ambitions 76. In the preceding decades, relations between the Russian ruler and the papacy - always mediated by the rulers of the House of Austria, who were reluctant to allow diplomatic channels that excluded them - had been marked by both interest and mutual distrust. Pius IV had attempted to invite the rulers of Poland, Prussia, and Muscovy

to the Council of Trent, leaving the emperor to choose the person best suited to carry out the mission. Ferdinand's response, however, had been cool because of the fears aroused by Rome's plan to grant Ivan IV a royal title and by the prospect of seeing the Muscovite invited to the Council as the heir of Byzantium. The pope entrusted the mission to the previously mentioned Giovan Francesco Canobio, who was also charged - unsuccessfully - with addressing with the tsar the question of peace among Russia, Poland, and the fragile confederation of ecclesiastical principalities, Hanseatic trading cities, and territories of the Livonian Brothers of the Sword known as Livonia 77.

In the early 1570s relations among Rome, the Empire, and Russia became entangled with the extinction of the Polish-Lithuanian Jagiellonian dynasty. On the death of King Sigismund II Augustus in 1572, the confederation between the kingdom of Poland and the grand duchy of Lithuania that he had promoted, the *Serenissima respublica Poloniae*, once again became an elective monarchy. The Polish nobility, deeply divided between an anti-Habsburg party strong among those who had embraced the Reformation and a Lithuanian nobility partly Orthodox in confession, appeared unable to agree on a new election. Catherine de' Medici's France skillfully exploited this division and secured the success of Henry of Valois's candidacy, in part through the support of the papal nuncio in Poland, Vincenzo Lauro 78, a personal friend of Gregory XIII. It has already been noted that after the death of his brother Charles IX in 1574, Henry left Kraków almost secretly, having refused to marry Anna, the elder sister of Sigismund II, as the local nobility had asked. This opened a new interregnum for the *Respublica*, during which Emperor Maximilian II, one of the candidates for election together with his son Ernest, placed the Gorizian vice-chancellor Giovanni Cobenzl at the head of a legation sent to Muscovy in an attempt to open negotiations with Ivan IV. The grand duchy of Muscovy had long lacked stable diplomatic relations with the Empire, but its growing importance on the eastern stage now made it necessary to bring it back within the orbit of Habsburg diplomacy 79.

The emperor's plan was to divide the Polish-Lithuanian confederation and secure the kingdom of Poland for himself, leaving the grand duchy of Lithuania to the tsar's sons. Any agreement, however, depended upon the choices of the Polish and Lithuanian electors and upon the attitude of the papal curia, whose support was essential to legitimizing the Polish succession. The matter was especially important in the pope's eyes because of Poland's fundamental role as a Catholic bulwark on the frontier with Islam and Orthodoxy. Since the early 1560s Morone had followed its political and religious affairs in preparation for the resumption of the Council of Trent. He had maintained an extensive correspondence with the nuncio in Poland, Berardo Bongiovanni, bishop of Camerino and an old associate 80, to whom, as later to his successor Giovan Francesco Commendone, he explained the guiding principles of papal diplomacy in Poland 81. At the beginning of 1566 it was Morone who drafted the instructions for Nuncio Giulio Ruggeri 82. The Polish clergy had appealed to him in 1564 for exemption from the Tridentine decrees on the accumulation of benefices, as did the pro-imperial nobles during the dynastic crises of 1573 and 1576 and the Polish ambassadors at that year's Diet of Regensburg 83. It was a continuous commitment to curial work, the handling of correspondence 84, diplomatic action, and the protection of the Church's interests, always undertaken with the lucid awareness that “in these wretched times it seems that not losing is a kind of gain,” to use the words with which Ruggeri informed him from Lublin on 29 March that the Diet had concluded “without any prejudice to the Catholic religion” 85.

Among the tasks entrusted to Bongiovanni, in addition to urging the participation of the Polish episcopate in the Council reconvened by Pius IV, were monitoring the spread of heresy and reforming clerical morals. These questions were discussed at the synod of Władysław in April 1561, which also tried to improve the education offered to laypeople and ecclesiastics by episcopal schools. Bongiovanni's plan to introduce the Jesuits, however, aroused strong opposition, and the effort to encourage Polish prelates to attend the Council of Trent met with little success. Together with developments in the war against Muscovy, which also caused the king's absence, these matters stood at the center of his letters to Morone. During the final phase of the Council, Morone sought to ease tensions between the Roman curia and the Polish crown, which had been angered by the dispatch of a papal legate to the tsar during the Muscovite war to persuade him to send representatives to Trent 86. They were three difficult and exhausting years for Bongiovanni, who was forced

to go “wandering and struggling through this ice, these stables and heated chambers,” with meager results, as he wrote to the Milanese cardinal on 13 November 1562 87.

In the following years Morone also followed the activities of Commendone, who was sent to Poland for the first time as nuncio after Bongiovanni's return. His principal task was to prevent the convocation of a national council, upon which both Sigismund Augustus - who hoped thereby to obtain dissolution of his marriage to Catherine of Habsburg, daughter of Emperor Ferdinand I - and Primate Jakub Uchański - who wished to make it the forum for a policy of mediation with members of the Reformed nobility - had set their hopes. The new nuncio was also charged with securing promulgation of the Tridentine decrees, which could be made effective only by a decision of the Polish episcopate as a whole, taken at a provincial synod. At the Diet of Parczów in August 1564, the king solemnly promised to adopt the conciliar decrees, but in practice the bishops avoided committing themselves, at least until the synod of Piotrków in 1577. Commendone's third undertaking was the struggle against heresy, in which he revived a plan already proposed by his predecessor and supported by Cardinal Hosjusz for expelling foreign dissidents. Sigismund Augustus adopted the plan and, by the edict of Parczów of 7 August 1564, expelled from the kingdom all foreigners regarded as heretics, though in practice its effect was almost entirely limited to Italian anti-Trinitarians 88. Commendone also continued to monitor the movements of the elderly Bernardino Ochino, who had taken refuge in Poland in 1563, and wrote to Morone about him on several occasions, announcing with evident satisfaction Ochino's expulsion in March 1564 89.

As we have seen, one of the objectives of Morone's dispatch to Regensburg was to insert papal diplomacy into the negotiations over the Polish crown, with firm support for the House of Austria, upon whose loyalty to Catholicism Rome believed it could rely 90. If the Polish-Lithuanian question had to be settled by military means, Gregory XIII had planned to grant Maximilian II a subsidy of up to 100,000 scudi, one quarter of which would be placed directly in the legate's hands 91. In addition, Morone was charged with following the negotiations between the Empire and Muscovy over a proposed military alliance against the voivode of Transylvania, Stephen Báthory, and the possible partition of the Polish-Lithuanian state, not least because the papacy feared that Lithuania might pass beyond the orbit of its religious influence. Morone therefore had the task of establishing contact with Nuncio Lauro in Poland, in the hope that a possible armed conflict between the emperor and Báthory, whose closeness to the sultan was well known, might provide a basis for consolidating a new Holy League. The “Transylvanian” Báthory, however, had already been crowned, and the Holy See could not maintain hostile relations with him without endangering the position of Catholics in Poland 92.

Despite his very clear pro-Habsburg mandate, Morone therefore had to exercise all his diplomatic skill in order to appear neutral, seeking to preserve the image of the pope as the common father of Christian Europe and to bring all Catholic forces together in a crusade against the Ottoman Empire. In reality, papal policy in the conflict between Maximilian II and Stephen Báthory over rights to the Polish-Lithuanian crown proved rather contradictory. On the one hand, Rome assured the emperor of its commitment to support an expedition against Báthory, especially if the latter were backed by Ottoman power, thereby encouraging war. On the other hand, it urged him to seek a peaceful settlement of the conflict, all the more so when, in 1576 itself, the Hungarian ruler showed himself increasingly well disposed toward Rome, where he was preparing a mission to present his obedience to Gregory XIII 93. This ambiguous attitude disappointed and embittered the emperor, as the Spanish ambassador at Regensburg, Francisco Hurtado de Mendoza, clearly perceived while anxiously observing the growing mutual distrust between the legate - and the pope he represented - and Maximilian II.

By the time Morone reached Regensburg, he therefore possessed a thorough knowledge of Polish-Lithuanian affairs, and he became convinced that the Diet would have little significant influence upon them because of continuing Habsburg indecision 94. Nuncio Lauro himself was skeptical of the mediation strategy proposed to the legate: “If the emperor wishes at some later time to attend to the affairs of that kingdom,” he wrote to Morone, “he will have to turn Poland upside down together with all Christendom, because by then Báthory will already have sufficiently consolidated his position” 95. On this front, therefore, the legation

resulted not so much in no outcome as in a worsening of relations between Rome and the Empire 96. The situation would become still more tangled in the following weeks, when Lauro, acting on instructions from Rome, delayed the Holy See's recognition of the new monarch. This angered Báthory, who confronted him with an ultimatum: either appear before him or leave Poland. The nuncio then withdrew to Silesia, with Morone's approval, though the cardinal advised him to postpone his return to Rome because his experience still made him indispensable on the spot. Again following the legate's advice, Gregory XIII decided not formally to recall his representative. Morone's prudence ultimately proved successful, for the new king chose to submit to the pope, sending a mission that reached Rome at the beginning of September. This marked the beginning of reconciliation between the papacy and Báthory, who by December 1576 was already being referred to in Roman diplomatic correspondence as “His Most Serene Majesty the King” 97.

4. Russia: Projects and Utopias

The aspects of Morone's legation to Regensburg that most directly concerned relations between Rome and Russia, and that were in various ways intertwined with the Polish question, also ended unhappily. We already know that in the first half of the 1570s the emperor had sought the support of Tsar Ivan IV for the election of Archduke Ernest to the Polish-Lithuanian throne. This was also why the Habsburg urged Russian representatives to attend the Diet of 1576, taking advantage of the previously mentioned proposal - which never came to fruition - for an alliance against the Turks involving the pope and Spain. In this context, Cobenzl, who had long experience of diplomatic relations with the curia 98, sent Giovanni Dolfin a long letter at the end of May 1576 describing his journey to Muscovy and his meeting with Ivan IV. It contained an extensive account of the rituals of the Orthodox Church and the religious life of Russian believers, together with comparisons between Eastern and Catholic practices that, by invoking the Council of Florence of 1439, alluded to Gregory XIII's cherished plan to reunite the Orthodox world with the Roman Church. To this end the pope immediately set Dolfin and Morone to work, before eventually sending the Jesuit Antonio Possevino to the Muscovite court in 1581-82 99. It was on this basis that Morone was charged at Regensburg with handling relations with Russia and meeting its ambassadors, while remaining in constant contact with Lauro and keeping the curia informed of the development of their relations with the emperor 100. In Gregory XIII's eyes, a military alliance between the Empire and Muscovy, supported by the papacy, might revive the spirit of the Catholic league that had so miserably fallen apart immediately after Lepanto. Yet Ivan IV, the Terrible, enjoyed no good reputation in the West, where reports had spread of atrocities and massacres perpetrated by the Russians against the population of Livonia. Nor could an experienced diplomat such as Morone fail to see that the prospect of reunifying the Churches of Rome and Moscow was excessively ambitious: not only because of the enormous geographical, political, and cultural distances involved, but also because Gregory XIII's activism would inevitably encounter the Habsburgs' traditional distrust of overly direct relations between the Roman Church and the tsars 101.

Negotiations between Morone and Muscovy effectively began only when Ivan IV's ambassador arrived at Regensburg in mid-July 1576. The emperor “caresses him greatly and treats him well,” it was reported, “but they are coarse men, as people say” 102. The discussion was immediately framed around the struggle against the Turks, since the ambassador proposed to Maximilian II the formation of a league against the Porte, offering “all his forces” but demanding in return that the “Transylvanian” should under no circumstances remain king of Poland, “because he is a dependent of the Turk.” Morone advised the emperor to determine whether the tsar in fact possessed “great and sufficient forces” for war against the Ottomans, as well as “great means of harassing Lithuania.” The Milanese cardinal approved the decision to send a trusted agent to the Muscovite, adding subtly - although he had received no instructions from Rome to do so - that the pope himself might send “someone there, if it were judged expedient.” Predictably, the Habsburg understood the legate's ultimate objective perfectly well and replied “that first the aids here in the Empire had to be settled, and only then could one think further,” shifting the discussion back to Poland 103.

In Rome, Gregory XIII saw in this slight possibility of speaking directly with Ivan IV a potential opening. He ordered Gallio to write to Morone that “with the opportunity presented by the Muscovite ambassador,

who should now be at the Diet, Our Lord thinks it very good that Your Most Illustrious Lordship should seek through him to establish dealings and an understanding with his prince, in order to advance toward union and recognition of the Holy Apostolic See." The pope hoped that the legate would proceed at his own discretion, whether by writing to the tsar or by giving instructions to an ambassador to be sent to Russia 104. While Maximilian II was preparing to hand documents to Ivan's ambassadors before their return - and his court was agonizing over whether to address the tsar as "Caesar" or "emperor" 105 - Rome decided that it was now preferable to "hasten the confederation with the Muscovite," in the hope of concluding a league that would also include Spain, Portugal, Venice, and the Italian princes. To this end Gregory XIII authorized Morone himself to send an emissary to the tsar in the pope's name, charged with delivering a brief that the curia sent him on 11 August, though fully aware that this could be done only with imperial approval.

Rome even advanced the idea that the elderly legate should travel eastward "in the company of the Muscovite's ambassador when he returns home, because otherwise one might fear that the passage would later be too difficult for him" 106. Morone let the suggestion drop. He wrote that he had established "friendly dealings" with the Russian ambassador and instead drew the pope's attention to the emperor's intention to send to the tsar either the duke of Pomerania or the bishop of Lübeck, both heretics. He therefore tried to persuade Maximilian "to change the person and send a Catholic, since one may doubt that a heretic will ever perform an office in good accord with the Apostolic See" 107. New instructions from Rome dated 18 August urged the legate, still tormented by gout, to persuade the emperor of the need to pressure the tsar until he agreed "to recognize the superiority of the Holy Roman Apostolic See, and to insist that his patriarch do the same, since it is not fitting that so great a Christian prince as he should permit his metropolitan to be subject in spiritual matters to the metropolitan of Constantinople, who is himself subject to the Turk" 108.

At the end of the month the cardinal had to write to Rome in deep disappointment that the Muscovite ambassador, now preparing to depart, had refused to discuss "anything at all" with him, claiming to have received no mandate from his sovereign beyond speaking with the emperor. "They are very strange people and most superstitious in religion, besides the heresies they hold against the true faith of the Apostolic See," he concluded bitterly 109, after acknowledging the failure of his efforts to begin a dialogue and the "barbarous manner of proceeding of these Muscovites" 110. Yet since he had already decided to contact the tsar "at least to begin some dealings with him," Morone, true to character, did not give up. He drafted a Latin letter dated 27 August, addressed to the "*serenissimo ac potentissimo principi czar, magno moscovitarum duci*." Without making any reference to the prospect of union between the two Churches, it emphasized their shared purposes against the Turks and expressed the hope for an alliance between that most powerful ruler, "*bellicae virtutis gloria clarissim[us]*," and the other Christian princes. He then tried to have it delivered to the tsar either through the emperor's agents who would escort the Russian ambassador home or through Rudolf Clencke, or von Clenck, professor of theology at the University of Ingolstadt. Rome prepared a detailed *Instructio* for Clencke that envisaged the subsequent dispatch of Roman theologians to Moscow with a view to union of the Churches 111. The pope's grand designs were destined to disappear with the death of Maximilian II, but Morone's relationship with Clencke continued in later years. The theologian went on corresponding with him about the implementation of the Tridentine decrees and canon law, and also continued supplying information to Porcia, who wrote to the cardinal praising Clencke's "great spirit" but warning him "not to measure Clencke's courage and worth by his outward appearance: he writes of Swedish and Muscovite affairs as though they were places three days' journey away, and he seems to itch to remain even more deeply involved so that he may see that great tsar of his again" 112.

With the Muscovite prospects failed and the emperor dead, Morone retraced his steps, leaving a Germany already gripped by winter for Rome. Once again risking his life, he crossed the Alps, descended into an Italy devastated by plague, and on reaching his destination saw the pope walking barefoot in procession to implore God's mercy after proclaiming an extraordinary jubilee 113. No doubt during that journey the legate reflected on how swiftly everything had happened in those middle decades of the century; on how profoundly the continent he had once again traversed had changed, while he remained faithful to what was now only one of the Christian Churches of the West; on how things might have turned out differently had the men beside

whom he had labored at Regensburg thirty-five years earlier succeeded in reaching an agreement; or on what might have happened had Pole and he himself been called to take the reins of Christendom. But those times were now over and seemed immensely distant, while fatigue, illness, and old age were taking possession of his body. Perhaps this was why he could not help reflecting on the words with which Giovanni Dolfin commented on the emperor's death, observing that “God granted him the great grace of enough time for this Diet to be concluded” 114.

Morone reached Rome on 17 November 1576 and was once again received by Gregory XIII in a public consistory to which he had to resign himself 115. The pope rewarded him with “favors befitting his reputation and the labors performed for Holy Church” 116. According to the Este resident, his arrival “has begun to show the whole world, and this court in particular, how highly the Holiness of Our Lord esteems his person.” The same report announced the elevation to the cardinalate of Andreas of Austria, second son of Archduke Ferdinand, almost certainly at the Milanese cardinal's urging 117. In a speech lasting three hours in that consistory, Morone gave “an excellent account of his German labors,” as Gallio benevolently reported to Porcia on the twenty-first 118. In reality, we know that on that occasion the legate had to excuse his failing memory, age, and weakness, referring instead to what he had written to the pope from time to time. After Gregory summarized the events at Regensburg on his behalf, Morone felt obliged to apologize “if he happened to lose the thread of his discourse, if he had not spoken with adequate eloquence and explained everything in a clear order, as would have been necessary, or if his memory had been forced to yield to old age” 119. Yet if his memory was weak and his speech uncertain, the Milanese cardinal seemed not to have lost a single fragment of his political lucidity. This is attested by the account of a “most profound discourse on Polish affairs” with the Este resident in Rome, Giulio Masetti, who on 8 January 1576 reported in cipher to Ferrara Morone's conviction that the “loss” of that kingdom was now imminent 120:

> Whether one of those Piasts succeeds, or the king of Sweden, or the Transylvanian, or others from those regions, there is no doubt that it will soon fall into the hands of the Turk. He judges the same even if that kingdom were to remain in the person of the king of France, for because of the great distance from Poland to France the Turk would necessarily enter it with his armies. Here he also touched upon the poor showing made by the king of France, who leads a life devoted to pleasures and attends to nothing honorable, and who at first inspired the greatest hopes but then failed badly to fulfill them. He added the proverb: *parturient montes, nascitur ridiculus mus*. Continuing, he said that the king of France was losing France through his bad government, and Poland with it.

Before returning home, Morone had sent Rome from Munich some information about the new emperor Rudolf II, who had shown himself so receptive to the “many loving and Catholic counsels” Morone had given him that the cardinal was convinced “His Majesty is most Catholic, prudent, and of an affectionate nature, and that if His Holiness embraces him paternally, he may be certain of having him as an obedient son” 121. These were encouraging words, intended to instill new hope among his colleagues for the future of Europe. As shown by an “account of the affairs of Regensburg” drafted shortly afterward 122, the dean's letter was received in the curia as a good omen. Yet the man who wrote it could no longer hope to see those hopes fulfilled: perhaps somewhat dimmed in eloquence and memory, he nevertheless remained a giant in the Roman curia of those years, surrounded by reverential respect for the history he had lived.

5. The End of an Era

For those who retrace the lives of men and women of the past, death often announces itself with no warning other than the thinning out - at first imperceptible, then increasingly evident - of their written traces. So it was with Giovanni Morone. During the final years of his life, though afflicted by “poor health,” he continued to correspond with his many interlocutors and to concern himself with his customary problems - from jurisdiction over the diocese and city of Aquileia to the Dominican general chapter held that year, from the Portuguese dynastic crisis to the health of Cardinal Luigi d'Este and then to an “extremely hateful lawsuit” that broke out between him and his brother, Alfonso II, duke of Ferrara 123. Yet the pace of his replies slowed, not least because the correspondence addressed to him became progressively thinner. Until the final silence. The Europe that then lay before his tired eyes was as different from the Europe of the Italian

Wars, in which his father had played a leading role, as it was distant from the political and religious goals to which he had always devoted himself. After the division between the German and Spanish branches of the House of Austria and the establishment of a powerful *pax hispanica* from the Alps to Sicily, the peninsula no longer knew the imperial authority that had once dominated it. From the Diet of Augsburg and the end of the Council of Trent onward, the Habsburgs of Vienna - Ferdinand, Maximilian, and finally Rudolf - had acted with substantial autonomy from the Roman Church, abandoning every attempt to devise a common policy toward the now firmly established Lutheran reality. The exhaustion of Erasmian Spain and of the universalist myths of Charles V's immense empire had brought to an end in Italy a period marked by a difficult but intense relationship between religious and secular culture 124. The pontificates of Paul IV and Pius V had created an irreversible break, while the tragic and interminable inquisitorial affair of Bartolomé Carranza not only linked the first pontificate to the second with a red thread but also directly connected Italy and Spain. The human and religious experience of the archbishop of Toledo cannot be understood without taking account of the ties he had earlier maintained with Juan de Valdés and later with Reginald Pole and the *Ecclesia viterbiensis* during the Tridentine debates on justification and then in England. Yet when, in 1576, after seventeen years of imprisonment, he was finally forced to submit to abjuration, his had become merely a Spanish and Roman case, no longer a European one like those of Pole and Morone, whose background had still been the political realities and religious problems of the age of Charles V.

In the final years of his life, the Milanese cardinal could scarcely have recognized in the Roman curia and the Sacred College of which he was dean the atmosphere, culture, and men of his early maturity, as his former colleagues and friends disappeared one after another: Ercole Gonzaga and Girolamo Seripando in 1563, Guido Ascanio Sforza in 1564, Ranuccio Farnese and Bernardo Navagero in 1565, Ippolito d'Este in 1572, Otto Truchsess in 1573, and Cristoforo Madruzzo in 1578. Of the seventy-one cardinals created by Paul III, only five survived him. In this light one may also assess the isolation in which the son of Francesco Sforza's chancellor found himself at the end of his life: the young man who had witnessed Charles V's coronation at Bologna in 1530 and taken the first steps of his ecclesiastical career in the Rome of Clement VII after the Sack; the exceptionally skillful nuncio in the convulsed Germany of the 1530s and 1540s; the man who had opened the way for the Council of Trent and, after becoming a cardinal barely past the age of thirty, had twice been called to preside over it at an interval of twenty years, after paying dearly for his brief Valdesian experience alongside the *spirituali*. By 1580, the year of his death, the long and tormented conciliar season inaugurated by the election of Paul III and concluded under Pius IV had run its course. The tensions, contradictions, and conflicts that had divided the upper reaches of the ecclesiastical hierarchy over the foundations, goals, programmatic lines, and practical instruments of the reform the Council of Trent was called upon to promote had also been almost entirely absorbed. Religious dissent, which from the 1530s to the 1560s had coursed through Italian society, especially its urban centers, and penetrated the very summit of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, had likewise been almost completely extinguished and repressed.

After an extremely long moral, religious, and political crisis, the papal Church once again presented itself as *mater et magistra*: as a credible and indispensable vehicle of salvation, as the driving center of a Catholicism now free from uncertainty, “vibrant, assertive, if often uncompromising,” founded upon an “absolutist ideology” and upon the *recte sentire* that sustained it 125, bent on conquering the new worlds and reconquering old Europe. Along its bloody confessional frontiers, Rome prepared with renewed pride to wage the apologetic and controversial battles that already during Gregory XIII's reign had found champions of immense learning in the Oratorian Cesare Baronio and the Jesuit Roberto Bellarmino. If the former's *Annales ecclesiastici* and *Martyrologium romanum*, together with the works of Onofrio Panvinio, Tommaso Bosio, and Antonio Gallonio in their effort to “inventory the holiness” of the past 126, would claim on the terrain of history Rome's primacy and the continuity of its teaching authority, founded upon the blood of the ancient martyrs and the proto-Christian communities whose heroic greatness the catacombs were revealing, the latter's *Controversiae* would be able to combat the doctrines of heretics on equal terms by asserting the primacy of papal authority as the indispensable norm of the truths of faith. Without entirely renouncing humanist and Renaissance culture, the new Counter-Reformation orthodoxy would succeed in bending it to pedagogical and celebratory ends. It would employ preachers and missionaries even in the internal “Indies”

inhabited by peasants and mountain people who had been only poorly and superficially Christianized and were immersed in a world of magical and witchcraft superstition, in order to transmit a message of repentance, conversion, discipline, and obedience now free from the theological disputes of the past and purged of all criticism of the clergy and pastors entrusted with the care of the Christian people.

A print by Étienne Dupérac from 1578 depicts the orderly unfolding of a solemn papal ceremony in the Sistine Chapel. The ecclesiastical hierarchies are neatly arranged in the choir and the laity kept outside; the papal throne stands on the left and the altar in the center, while behind it a canopy conceals the mouth of hell that Michelangelo had painted directly before the celebrant 127. The image was intended to present to a broad public a Church new and different from the one that until the recent past had been the object of severe criticism, condemnation, and invective. A preacher, for example, was immediately imprisoned after daring, even though he confined himself to the “usual commonplaces,” to speak before the pope against “the idleness and luxury of prelates,” as Michel de Montaigne recorded in his *Journal de voyage* during his stay of 1580-81 in a Rome that had been “greatly moralized,” whose “pomp […] and […] chief grandeur lie in the display of devotion,” especially by its “hundred and more confraternities” 128. It was the *Roma sancta* that the English Catholic Gregory Martin would describe at precisely that time, listing its churches, relics, liturgies, processions, pious institutions, seminaries, convents, monasteries, hospitals, and confraternities, and complacently emphasizing “the contempt and neglect of all profane and heathen monuments” as proof of the establishment of Christ's kingdom 129. Rome was now ready once again to present itself as a *civitas perfecta*, with the *theatrum mundi* of the papal curia at its center: the beating heart of a Church that had overcome the trauma of the Protestant Reformation, taken stock of the grievous mutilations it had caused, recovered new strength, and consolidated its hierarchies around the indefectible *plenitudo potestatis* of Christ's vicar over the entire community of the faithful. Rome had returned to being and feeling itself the *caput mundi*, now able to look ahead, enter upon new paths, and equip itself for the difficult battles awaiting it against heretics, schismatics, unbelievers, pagans, sinners, free spirits, sorcerers, and witches - in a word, against the eternal presence of evil and the devil in history 130. It was the papal Rome whose millennial history Gregory Martin could present under the sign of the perpetual assistance of the spirit of God, in accordance with the prophecies of Holy Scripture 131.

The image of the papal Church had been very different half a century earlier, when the Sack of Rome inflicted a profound wound upon it, hailed by many as God's deserved punishment for the infinite abuses that reigned there and for its deafness to every demand for reform and every summons to its pastoral mission, whether expressed in the learned and measured form of Vincenzo Quirini and Paolo Giustiniani's *Libellus ad Leonem X* of 1513 or in the fiery and sometimes violent prophetic invectives of Girolamo Savonarola. The smiling cynicism of a typical Medici and later Farnese courtier such as Paolo Giovio - a brilliant man of letters who never for a moment considered attending to his diocese of Nocera - offers a vivid picture of curial resistance to genuine renewal and helps explain its reasons. On 23 January 1547, for example, the day after the approval of the decree on justification “in defiance of Martin Luther,” he hoped that the Holy Spirit would soon come and close that hateful Council once and for all, “because we shall have carried out the necessary reform without spoiling the pheasant's tail of the honor of Christ and his vicar.” A moderate reform, certainly, carried out “with skill and temperance” 132, taking account of the impossibility of “reforming with extreme severity the customs and manner of the Roman court,” not least because vices would last as long as humankind, as he had theorized a few years earlier 133. Hence his profound admiration for Pope Farnese, the “happy enjoyer of the benefit of time,” and his hope - as he delighted in writing with biting irony - that the emperor would allow “this reform at Trent without spoiling the pheasant's tail, so that what happens to the overly Theatine does not happen to the Apostolic See: out of modesty, in order not to show too large a codpiece, they do not mind tearing off their testicles with one that is tight and low.” In his view, moreover, “to open the Council was to open the great brothel,” and the violent conflict between pope and emperor over its transfer to Bologna risked degenerating into a schism capable of “destroying this beautiful machine of beneficent Rome, receiver and nurturer of fine and graceful minds.” These words reveal an idea of the Church wholly bound to the past and viscerally hostile to every innovation 134:

> I would wish our Charles V great, unconquered, and glorious, since we have no more ready and powerful shield against the Ottomans; but I would not wish him, for the jest of a lean shaven crown, to send us off to Cockaigne, or the successor of Pope Paul to turn out, copied from life, a brother of Pope Hormisdas or Pope Zephyrinus, who said Mass in a chasuble of buckram, gave the holy blessing beneath a brass tiara adorned with Murano pebbles, and ate dried gourds softened into soup.

When Morone labored at Regensburg to understand what was happening on the borders of Catholic Europe, that world had already vanished. Even if the Tridentine reforms were slow to affect the Church's institutional structure and clerical conduct, a new climate was imposing itself: devout compunction for some, fervent militancy for others. If an ancient and consolidated reality was difficult to change, at least its models and scale of values changed, and sometimes only its appearances. The political world itself, through which he had moved for more than forty years with incomparable ease, now appeared utterly transformed, perhaps unrecognizable in Morone's eyes. He died in Rome on 1 December 1580, just over seventy years old, worn down by illness and so many labors, but still perfectly lucid, as suggested by his late portrait painted by Scipione Pulzone. In it, from a gaunt face framed by a white beard around a toothless mouth, sharp and slightly crossed eyes gaze vividly at the viewer (plate 9) 135. The year was ending in which France had once again begun to tear itself apart in yet another civil war, the definitive division of the Netherlands had provided fresh fuel for the conflict raging there, a Calvinist prince had become elector Palatine, the duke of Alba's troops had entered Portugal to annex it to the crowns of Philip II, and Francis Drake had reappeared triumphantly on the Thames after circumnavigating the globe.

Confronted with the great political problems of the age, Gregory XIII could not dispense with Morone's counsel even in the twilight of the cardinal's life. In 1577, for example, Pietro Lauro continued to write to him about Polish affairs, although he knew Morone was always informed of them “by the public dispatches,” in order to obtain his advice. The archbishop of Gniezno and Polish primate Jakub Uchański, the Lithuanian prince Mikołaj Radziwiłł, and King Stephen Báthory himself likewise appealed to him 136. In the same year, at the request of the Spanish ambassador, Morone successfully urged the pope to devote greater attention to the dramatic crisis in the Netherlands at the other end of Europe, insisting upon the crucial importance of “preserving religion in those states” 137. Still in 1577 he kept informed about the Diet of Prague 138, while an old acquaintance, Girolamo Federici, involved him in the resignation of the diocese of Geneva by the Franciscan Angelo Giustiniani of Chios 139. And when news of the death of King Sebastian of Portugal reached Rome in 1578, the pope wished to keep it secret and informed only Tolomeo Gallio and Giovanni Morone 140.

The old cardinal's formal assignments nevertheless became increasingly sporadic. As late as September 1580 he was discussing questions of Milanese jurisdiction with the pope, but on the twenty-first a rumor spread that he had “died a sudden death” at Velletri. The report was quickly denied, yet it was enough to set in motion the competition to succeed him in his offices. “Your Most Illustrious Lordship should seek to retain the protectorship of the Fabric of Saint Peter in your own person, since it has always been customary for this superintendence to belong to the cardinal deans, as Carpi and Morone have held it,” Ascanio Celso wrote to Alessandro Farnese on 24 September, as Farnese prepared to inherit the post 141. In reality the elderly Milanese cardinal's health had suddenly collapsed. A month later, on 26 November, it was reported that “he is greatly burdened by fever and is in a very bad condition, having taken medicine this morning and sent for His Holiness's blessing” 142. He died five days later, “to the sorrow of this entire court, having closed and sealed his course with truly Christian actions worthy of his prudence,” a Roman newsletter writer reported on 3 December, while giving details of the modest funeral and tomb epitaph he had arranged, his will, and the distribution of his benefices 143:

> He left 4,000 ducats to his household, rewarding each person according to merit, to be taken from the pension of Modena. Two thousand scudi in Spain have fallen vacant, 1,500 on Bergamo to Cardinal Cornaro, and as much to Priuli on Vicenza; 800 to the bishop of Nepi [Orazio Morone], 1,000 to Signor Giulio Morone, and he appointed his brother's son heir to 20,000 scudi. The protectorship of Loreto is given to Cardinal Guastavillani, that of Saint Dominic to Alessandrino [Michele Bonelli], that of the Cistercians to Sens [Nicolas de Pellevé], Saint Benedict to Commendone, and those of Charity, the Convertite, and the

> Lazzarelli to Como [Tolomeo Gallio]; the palace in Trastevere to Gambara [sic]. Farnese, leaving Porto to Perugia, will be bishop of Ostia and dean.

That same day the Venetian ambassador specified that death had come “after he had spent ten days in bed with two alternating tertian fevers and troublesome complications that finally brought him down” 144, and that on his deathbed

> His Most Illustrious Lordship, feeling himself failing, addressed his whole household on several matters, and more than once said that he forgave those who had persecuted him, declaring that never in his life had he dissented in any matter from the Catholic religion and that he died in it. He had ordered that only one hundred ducats be spent on his obsequies and that he be carried to the Minerva without any pomp; but when His Holiness learned of this, he summoned all the cardinals and all the other officials and paid the entire expense himself.

As soon as the cardinal closed his eyes on 1 December, his nephew and heir Girolamo Morone, son of his brother Sforza, hastened to inform the Catholic king of the death of that “devoted and heartfelt servant of Your Majesty's crown.” Girolamo in turn professed himself its “most faithful […] subject and vassal,” hoping to continue enjoying the king's “favors and graces” 145. The letter expressed certainty that his uncle, “in accordance with his actions and his end, has merited paradise,” an implicit celebration of his doctrinal orthodoxy. The same orthodoxy was carefully attested by the papal master of ceremonies, Francesco Mucanzio, who inserted in his diary a radiant eulogy of the illustrious cardinal and recorded that he had died with a crucifix in his hands, devoutly professing his fidelity to the Catholic Church 146:

> Before dawn Cardinal Giovanni Morone, bishop of Ostia and dean of the Sacred College, departed this life. He had carried out many and most important legations, especially at the Council of Trent; he was a man rich in merits for the benefit of Christendom, of great intelligence and ability, loved and cherished by all, of exemplary moral life, of the most lucid judgment in the most complex matters, exceedingly generous toward the poor and pious institutions, and never idle throughout his life despite never enjoying very robust health. Two days before his death he prayed to Jesus Christ with great devotion, holding a crucifix in his hands, commending to him the Catholic Church, the supreme pontiff, the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the faithful. He formally declared that he had always lived and wished to die in that same Catholic communion. And if anyone had ever thought otherwise, he forgave them and prayed God himself to forgive them.

These words could only sound like a bitter reproach to his most relentless detractors. So too did those reported to Philip II on 12 December by Abbot Bernardino Briceño, who informed him that shortly before dying devoutly the cardinal had said he knew himself to be a sinner and was about to appear before God's tribunal, from which he asked forgiveness; but he did not fear being questioned about ever having held erroneous religious opinions, because in this respect he had never offended Our Lord, and he forgave those who had persecuted him. Briceño observed that this crystal-clear profession of orthodoxy had been appreciated by some, including the pope, who had spoken in praise of what the cardinal had done while presiding over the Council, whereas others thought it better not to speak of the affair 147. The latter certainly included Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santoro of Santa Severina, who, recording Morone's death in his autobiography, chose to remember him as the man “who with the highest praise for prudence had carried out nearly thirteen legations for the Apostolic See, a man of eminent worth in the affairs of the world, but not regarded as very religious” 148. It was a crude and reductive judgment, but on closer inspection almost benevolent, and in any event now detached, on the part of a man wholly devoted to the cause of the “extermination of heresy” 149 and “regarded as an oracle in matters of the Holy Office” 150, who knew well that the “point at which many learned and illustrious men of our times had stumbled” was the doctrine of justification 151.

Until the end of his life, the inquisitorial affair of which he had been a victim in the 1550s continued to weigh upon Morone. This is shown by an obscure letter from Ascanio Celso, a very well-informed agent of Alessandro Farnese, who, reporting to him on 29 July 1577 the appointment of Cardinal Giacomo Savelli as head of the congregation of the Holy Office, added that “Morone has greatly sought this place in order to […] wash away the stain Paul IV gave him.” It is difficult to know what he meant, but a few months later, on 18 March 1578, he returned to the matter, reporting that on the following day the ailing Savelli would

convene the congregation in Cardinal Gambara's house, to whom he had “given an account of that affair of Morone.” It concerned an unspecified chest - whose owner and place of discovery are unknown - that Morone had caused a locksmith to open in their presence 152. The chest evidently contained sensitive documents if the Milanese cardinal was so eager to have it opened, perhaps because he feared what they might contain, or perhaps because he suspected they might conceal significant evidence of his innocence. In the silence of the sources, one cannot go beyond these fragile hypotheses.

Shortly afterward, in any case, his death would draw a veil of silence over such questions, preventing embarrassing reports and untimely posthumous controversies from escaping the closed precincts of the inquisitorial tribunal. This helps explain how the Milanese cardinal, with all that he represented, came in the final years of his life to appear as a kind of embarrassing relic but also an enigmatic ghost of the past, in whom the prestigious president of the Council of Trent merged with the impious heretic investigated by Pope Carafa. These contradictions were too lacerating to be tolerated in the years of the great controversial and apologetic certainties of a triumphant Counter-Reformation, which was also engaged in reconstructing a history and hagiography of itself 153.

Chapter Twenty-Seven

Conclusion: The Material Legacy and the Historical Image

1. The Burial

Several years before his death, Morone had already dictated the restrained and dignified inscription intended for the tomb that would receive his mortal remains in the Dominican basilica of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, of which he was titular cardinal 1. In the Milanese cardinal's intentions, the tomb was to consist simply of a marble slab bearing the family coat of arms. Among his earthly merits, he wished it to claim only his role as papal legate to the Council of Trent, which had been happily concluded under his presidency: “Here lies the body of Cardinal Giovanni Morone, Milanese patrician and bishop of Ostia, who was legate and president at the sacred Council of Trent. He lived […] years and died on the […] day. Pray to God for him.” His heirs merely completed the text with the missing figures, abandoning their initial thought of adding at the end the words “and a cardinal for thirty-eight years and six months” 2:

DOM
HIC • IACET • CORPUS • IOANNIS • CARD • MORONI
PATRITII • MEDIOLANENSIS • ET • EPISCOPI • OSTIENSIS
QUI • FUIT 3 • LEGATUS • APOSTOLICUS
IN • SACRO • CONCILIO • TRIDENTINO
ET • PRAESES • VIXIT • ANNOS • LXXI • MENSES
X • DIES • V • OBIIT • I • DECEMBRIS • MDLXXX
ORATE • DEUM • PRO • EO

Beneath the inscription and the cardinal's coat of arms of their illustrious uncle, placed at the center of the slab, Girolamo and Orazio Morone wished to attest their grief: “Girolamo Morone, count of Pontecurone and heir, and Orazio Morone, bishop of Sutri and Nepi, nephews on the father's side, in sorrow set this up for their excellent lord and uncle.” In the execution of the work, entrusted to the chisel of “Cesare the sculptor,” who received forty-five scudi for it 4, the text was nevertheless altered, perhaps to attribute the inscription on the slab solely to the deceased cardinal, “*ex testamento*”; to clarify their kinship with him, “*fratris filii*” rather than “*ex fratre nepotes*”; and to correct “*moestissime*” to “*moerentes*”:

HIERONIMUS • MORONUS • COMES • PONTIS • CORONI • HAERES
HORATIUS • MORONUS • EPISC • SUTRIN • ET • NEPESIN
FRATRIS • FILII • DNO • AC • PATRUO • OPTIMO
EX • TESTAMENTO • MOERENTES • POSUERUNT

Intended for the floor of the transept beside the steps leading up to the high altar 5, Morone's tomb was tampered with during the disastrous restorations of 1848-55. The work lacked proper direction, partly because of the tumultuous events of the Roman Republic, and caused serious damage denounced in the contemporary press and later investigated by a papal commission 6. It was on that occasion that the marble slab was moved to the right nave, in front of the Chapel of the Annunciation, which contains the tomb of Urban VII, as reported by a historian of the Dominican basilica whose chief concern was to affirm Morone's fidelity to the Roman Church 7. The slab remade in the nineteenth century does indeed stand before the Chapel of the Annunciation. Its engraved letters are already heavily worn and in some cases illegible, while the central coat of arms mentioned by Forcella seems to have disappeared, or at most to survive as a barely perceptible shadow of the mulberry tree, the *morone*. Shortly before the cardinal's death, that emblem had exercised the ingenuity of Francesco Ghesi, a mediocre man of letters from San Gimignano. On 2 July 1578 he dedicated to Morone a manuscript of no fewer than 103 folios, now almost illegible because the ink has eaten through the paper and the volume was poorly restored, supplementing his description of the “*arbor morus*,” the *morone* or mulberry tree, with a tortuous “hieroglyphic explanation” 8.

By an irony of fate, the basilica of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, grim theater of the Roman Holy Office's *autos de fe*, also contained the imposing funerary monument of Pope Carafa erected by Pius V, with an

iconographic program celebrating his everlasting merits in the struggle against heresy (plate 2) 9. The church also housed the tombs of various figures connected in different ways with Morone: Cardinal Virgilio Rosario, a mediocre follower of Pope Carafa who had been one of Morone's inquisitors; Cardinal Giacomo Puteo, who had signed his sentence of acquittal; Bartolomé Carranza, accused in Italy and Spain of professing heresies very similar to those of Morone and Pole; Egidio Foscarari, who succeeded him as head of the diocese of Modena in 1550 and was himself investigated for the help he gave Morone during the trial; Stefano Usodimare, also a Dominican, procurator and later master general of the order, who had sided with Julius III in protecting Morone from Bernardo Bartoli's accusations; illustrious colleagues close to him in the 1540s, such as Pietro Bembo and Tommaso Badia; his trusted majordomo Pompeo Machiavelli; and finally Paolo Manuzio, who at Morone's initiative had begun the enterprise of the Press of the Roman People. Even in the inquisitorial church par excellence, then, these tombs clearly evoked, for anyone with eyes to see, the conflicts that had torn apart the summit of the Church during the decades of the Council of Trent 10.

Morone's decision in 1564 to acquire and renovate a chapel, personally following the work and expenses 11, and to have himself buried in that church very probably arose from his position as protector of the Friars Preachers. The order's leaders accepted and perhaps encouraged the choice, which may also have been suggested by his desire to present himself as a convinced supporter of Thomist orthodoxy. In any event, in full accordance with his cardinalatial rank, Morone placed his tomb far from Milan, which had always remained the center of the family network. There, in the fifteenth-century main chapel of Santa Maria della Scala, his father Girolamo and his closest relatives were buried in “our Morone family tomb,” as Anna Morone Stampa's will of 1583 put it 12. Yet it may not have been accidental that, in entrusting his earthly remains to a basilica that had become a symbol of the Inquisition, Morone wished to place them beneath Michelangelo's *Risen Christ*, installed at the foot of the high altar in 1521 13. Nothing to this effect is stated in his wills, which neither explain the choice of Santa Maria sopra Minerva nor mention the location of the tomb within it 14. There can be little doubt, however, that in the 1530s and 1540s that image of the risen Christ could evoke the spiritual message of the *Beneficio di Cristo*. This is also suggested by the chapel Reginald Pole had built near the Roman church of Domine quo vadis, where a plaster copy of the statue is preserved. It is possible that the same message was present in the mind of the person who crudely engraved the figure of Saint John the Baptist on the title page of the collection of Valdesian and Flaminian writings published in 1545 under the title *Modo che si dee tenere nell'insegnare et predicare il principio della religione cristiana*. The connection may have been mediated by a bronze medal, of which Pole himself owned an example, showing on the obverse a profile of Christ crowned with thorns and on the reverse an image of Christ the Redeemer plainly derived from Michelangelo's masterpiece 15.

It is more than plausible that the tomb corresponded to one of the three trapdoors now visible at the foot of the steps leading to the high altar, directly beneath the Christ. Three years later, in 1583, Cardinal Zaccaria Dolfin was buried there, “before the steps of the high altar, near the tomb of Cardinal Giovanni Morone” 16. Dolfin too had been involved in Morone's inquisitorial trial, since on 9 January 1560 he had given testimony in Rome in Morone's defense. It was an opportunistic deposition, dictated solely by the political change marked by the election of Pius IV. Only twelve months earlier, when the wind was blowing in another direction, Dolfin had handed the Holy Office the register of letters sent by Contarini from Regensburg in 1541 and had given Carlo Carafa a memorandum violently attacking Contarini's irenic choices 17:

> Would to God, Most Illustrious and Most Reverend Monsignor, that matters concerning the holy faith had always been handled with the reverence for God and the living faith with which they are handled today by the Holiness of Our Lord; and would to God that the heretical spirit of seeking agreement between Catholics and heretics had not reigned, and did not still reign today in many. For from this, I believe, arose the whole foundation of the evil from which the Christian commonwealth now suffers. Those who stand in the middle are worse, and these mediators of concord more harmful, than open heretics. How much boldness it has given the heretics, and how much support it has added to their petition to be allowed with impunity to receive communion under both kinds, that it is publicly known that in the year 1541 the Most Reverend Legate, then at the Diet of Regensburg, undertook to propose to the holy memory of Paul III that he grant this practice.

2. The Will

The sobriety of the burial also testifies to Morone's manner of life. The income he had accumulated over the course of his ecclesiastical career - of which an approximate account has been given - had made him a cardinal capable of meeting with dignity the demands imposed by his position. We have seen that the Milanese cardinal's revenues increased markedly during the pontificate of Julius III and then stabilized in his final years at a level appropriate to his rank, although he continued to be regarded as a “poor” cardinal, probably because only his ecclesiastical income was taken into account 18. At his death, this was supplemented by several credits amounting to a few hundred scudi and by landed and real property, including his share of the family palace in Milan 19 and very probably the houses he purchased in Rome on 10 September 1572, one of them on the Lungara, in order to endow from their rental income “the chaplaincy erected in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva” 20. These considerable resources nevertheless did not allow him to compete with the wealthiest princes of the Church, as is shown among other things by his secluded and, all things considered, modest residence in Trastevere, a short distance from Ponte Sisto. At his death the palace was already the property of Giulio 21, whose long residence with his uncle in Rome had earned him significant tax exemptions 22. Morone's artistic patronage had likewise been sporadic. It included the altar of the Lombard church of Sant'Ambrogio al Corso, which he had erected in 1550 and which was later lost when the church was rededicated also to Saint Charles Borromeo, and the restoration of the curial palace overlooking the square of Santa Maria in Trastevere, the church of which he was titular cardinal from 1556 to 1560, though this work too can no longer be identified today 23.

With the consent of the Sacred College, it was Pius IV who on 13 January 1562 granted Morone the faculty to make a will in favor of his nephews. This was reaffirmed by another brief of 23 April 1564 allowing him freely to dispose of all he possessed, with the sole exceptions of his ring and the sacred vestments of his chapel, which were to be returned to the papal sacristy 24. Gregory XIII again granted Morone the *facultas testandi* on 4 April 1576 25, while Pius V on 14 May 1571 and Gregory XIII on 8 January 1578 authorized his nephews, first Giulio and then Orazio, to receive the inheritance 26. By then Morone had already signed his will, drawn up in Rome by the notary Giacomo Girardo on 21 March 1575 27 and later confirmed “*de verbo ad verbum*” - though in fact with some changes - by the will of 16 June 1580, probably after a worsening of his health. Declaring himself in full possession of his “mental, physical, sensory, and intellectual” faculties, the then dean of the Sacred College began by professing above all “his wish to live and die, with God's help, in the Catholic faith of the Holy Roman Church, mother and teacher of all the others.” He added that he had forgiven and continued to forgive all those who “had plotted anything against him, not only by deeds but also by words and thoughts,” a scarcely veiled reference to the accusations of heresy directed at him. He then commended his soul to God, imploring mercy “by virtue of the passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ and his sorrowful death,” while also entrusting himself to the intercession of the Virgin and the saints, among whom he named Saint Catherine of Alexandria and Saint Catherine of Siena. Like the latter, he asked to be buried in Santa Maria sopra Minerva, with a modest funeral costing no more than one hundred scudi, and dictated the inscription to be placed on his tomb. He also prescribed that on the day of burial three hundred Masses for his soul should be celebrated in the Dominican basilica, at the Aracoeli, at San Pietro in Montorio, and at San Francesco a Ripa in Trastevere.

The pious bequests by which Morone offered yet another testimony of his fidelity to the Catholic Church were fairly substantial. Three hundred scudi were assigned to the Hospital of the Orphans in Rome; two hundred each to the Hospice of the Convertite and to the Archconfraternity of Charity, of which he was protector, with instructions to distribute the money among the respectable poor and prisoners; one hundred to the Hospital of Sant'Ambrogio, also in Rome, another charitable institution under his protection. The Franciscans of San Pietro in Montorio had to content themselves with ten *rubbia* of grain 28 and a barrel of wine, while the nuns of Corpus Christi in Modena also received one hundred scudi. For reasons that cannot be established, the will of 1580 29 omitted the fifty scudi that the earlier instrument had assigned to the Theatines of San Silvestro al Quirinale and to the Capuchin friars 30. The testamentary executors were his majordomo Pompeo Machiavelli, a Bolognese 31, and his chamber master Girolamo Rovelli, a Milanese 32,

both long-standing and faithful collaborators of Morone, as well as his nephew Orazio, the illegitimate son of his brother Sforza. At Sforza's death at the beginning of 1578, the latter had transmitted his titles and patrimony to his firstborn son Girolamo, namesake of the former chancellor of Milan 33.

The cardinal uncle likewise named his nephew Girolamo universal heir, as Anna Morone Stampa would also do in 1583 34, and in turn laid down a complicated succession strategy specifying in minute detail who was to succeed Girolamo and his descendants in the absence of legitimate children or in the event of criminal penalties involving confiscation of property. Orazio, destined by his status to enter the priesthood, could nevertheless rely on Morone's affection and protection. In addition to assigning him a legacy of seven hundred scudi, a few weeks after signing his final will Morone obtained from Gregory XIII, on 27 August 1580, Orazio's appointment as bishop of Sutri and Nepi 35. In the spring of 1577 he wrote both to the Catholic king and to Don Juan de Zúñiga seeking support, pensions, and above all fulfillment of commitments previously undertaken in favor of his brother Sforza Morone and Sforza's sons Girolamo and Orazio. The Spanish ambassador advised the king to grant these requests in view of the fact that the cardinal's support had been valuable on various occasions and that “no one has the authority he has with His Holiness.” Yet at the end of June Morone still had to insist, while at the same time undertaking to do what Madrid asked of him on behalf of the duke of Alba, in the name of his longstanding “devotion” 36. Among his other close relatives, only his sister Eleonora, married first to Girolamo Botta and then to Giovan Francesco Vialardi, whose widow she became in 1536 at the age of twenty-eight, received the modest legacy of a silver basin and ewer 37. His nephew Giulio, to whom in December 1553 the cardinal had already donated all the property and rights belonging to him in the diocese of Lodi 38, received one thousand scudi, with which he was able to return to Milan, where he died the following year. Giulio's numerous children established the Roman branch of the family, whose surname changed to Moroni, and inherited the Trastevere palace now identified with the family, even though in the later sixteenth century the district was still poor and no aristocratic families lived there. It is impossible to establish precisely when and how Giulio became sole owner of the building, where the family remained until the nineteenth century.

The ties with the church of Santa Maria in Trastevere, whose cardinalatial title Morone had long held, therefore remained very close. Giulio's eldest son, Policarpo, was baptized there on 18 February 1571; his second son, Antonio, obtained a canonry there and later became abbot of San Pietro della Foresta, between Formia and Cassino, and finally of San Pietro in Vincoli; while the third son, Giovanni Carlo, became *referendarius utriusque Signaturae* and a canon of Saint Peter's 39. The now permanent settlement in Rome of this branch of the family helps explain the modesty of Giulio's testamentary bequests to relatives who remained in Milan, including his elderly mother, a son who was parish priest of Santa Maria di Carate, and a daughter who was a nun at the Annunziata. In his last will, dictated on 22 March 1575 in his palace, after commending his soul to God, the Virgin, and all the saints, he provided among other things that he should be buried in the Trastevere basilica “with a dignified funeral, accompanied by the chapter and canons of that church, the Capuchin friars, and the Roman confraternity of the Orphans,” assigning to it six scudi a year to celebrate a memorial Mass on each anniversary of his death. As for the palace, he prohibited its division, ordering that “it shall be and remain forever common and undivided as the residence of his sons,” and named the cardinal himself as his testamentary executor 40, thus reserving to him control of the place where he would live until his death. It was surely no coincidence that the cardinal had signed his own last will before the same Roman notary, Giacomo Girardo, on the preceding day 41.

Next in the list of Giovanni Morone's testamentary bequests came his closest secretaries and collaborators. Even in seventeenth-century Rome such men generally received monthly salaries ranging from six or seven scudi for the dean of the equerries, the first coachman, and the chamber assistant to a maximum of twelve scudi for the chaplain 42. Girolamo Rovelli, Bernardino Pontecurone, and Girolamo Parisetto were each rewarded with one hundred scudi, as were two of the household physicians, while a third received “a purple coach with two bay horses” worth eighty scudi 43. Other members of the household were assigned two hundred scudi, including the chamberlain Antonio Lombardo and the steward Battista Chiozza 44, because they were burdened with numerous children or poor relatives. Another chamberlain, Camillo

Aprosio of Ventimiglia, together with a Florentine coachman and the broker Girolamo da Varese, received only one hundred scudi. Morone also wished to make the latter a “free gift” of the money he had lent him “to purchase the office,” while Aprosio's brother Bernardino was rewarded with a further twenty-five scudi. Others, such as Antonio Confalonieri and Angelo Balbi, had to content themselves with fifty. Finally came the complicated hierarchy of servants 45: one hundred scudi to the household buyer Marco Rampino, to the coachman, and also to a former wardrobe keeper 46 and the former majordomo Pompeo Machiavelli 47; sixty to the pantry steward 48 and the train-bearer 49; fifty to the storekeeper, cook, chaplain, assistant wardrobe keeper, and assistant pantry steward; thirty to another chaplain, a chamber assistant, and the cupbearer, who also received a bedstead and straw mattress worth a little more than one scudo 50; twenty-five to the litter bearer and an equerry; twenty to a second cook and the cellarer; fifteen each to seven other equerries; ten to the gardener, who used half of it to buy himself “a mattress, bolster, bedstead, straw mattress, cover, sheets, everything extremely old” 51; and finally four scudi each to the kitchen scullions. In February 1581 many of them filed before a notary to certify receipt of what they were owed 52. It is difficult to determine whether other payments made by the heirs to people not mentioned in the Milanese cardinal's last will represented settlement of earlier debts, remuneration for services performed during the succession, or gifts ordered by the nephews to their own collaborators. Among these were one hundred scudi and various household furnishings worth another forty-six given to the “testamentary notary” Antonio Xinti “as a token of affection and for the many labors performed in the service of the lord count,” including the drafting of “all the instruments of the legacies” 53.

Altogether, more than forty people inherited money from Morone. This was presumably the size of the Milanese cardinal's permanent *familia*, some members of which could bear the title *familiares domestici et continui commensales*, with the associated privileges and exemptions. There were undoubtedly other servants who received no testamentary legacy and therefore escaped the list, and perhaps some of those more or less close and more or less ravenous relatives of whom Morone himself complained in a letter to Ludovico Beccadelli from Isola d'Orta on 15 April 1553: “I believe even more than what you write to me about the annoyance your household causes you, because I experience what mine do to me; and in conclusion I believe this is one of the crosses one takes on together with the tonsure” 54. The overall number of household members was nevertheless very small compared with other cardinalatial courts. The Florentine Niccolò Ridolfi housed between 140 and 180 mouths in his palace during the years 1535-50; the seventeen-year-old Giovanni de' Medici was already credited on 1 May 1560, only a few months after his appointment, with 186 household members and seventy-three mounts; and Bernardo Salviati had about 110 in 1562, divided among holders of “intimate offices,” “administrative offices,” “table offices,” and “stable offices,” under the direction of an auditor, a majordomo, and a chamberlain. In 1533, however, Ippolito de' Medici's *familia* numbered fully five hundred people, including many “bravos and captains,” only slightly fewer than the seven hundred in the household of his cousin Pope Clement VII. This made the courts of Ippolito d'Este and the “great cardinal” Alessandro Farnese, numbering respectively 275 in 1566 and 284 in 1589, appear almost Spartan. Nor should one forget the swollen retinues of hundreds of people accompanying important papal missions: Ercole Gonzaga's legation to Trent in 1562, where he arrived with 160 followers; Ippolito d'Este's legation to France in 1561 with 350; or the little more than three hundred with whom Ferdinando de' Medici traveled to Rome in 1569 55, prompting Alessandro Farnese to say that he had appeared “with so much display that he will leave us looking like rags” 56.

More than one trace of the firm political, economic, and cultural roots of Morone and his family in Lombardy remains in the cardinal's material inheritance. One expression of this was the decision of the universal heir Girolamo Morone to use, for financial management of the estate left by his uncle, the bank founded in 1550 by the extremely wealthy banker from Como, Bernardo Olgiati. In 1572 Olgiati had risen to the general depositary of the Apostolic Camera, an office that involved not only administering receipts and expenditures but also providing loans and advances, and from 1575 he became Gregory XIII's secret treasurer, that is, his private banker 57. Two trusted men of Count Girolamo, both naturally Milanese, were likewise rewarded by the cardinal with precious gifts or purchased objects from his inheritance that the nephew placed on the market almost immediately 58: Ottavio Archinto, who received one hundred scudi “as

a token of affection and for the many labors performed” 59, and Antonio Confalonieri, a former member of Morone's own household, who were charged with assisting the testamentary executors. They appear to have carried out this task with tact and discretion, handling numerous deposits and withdrawals “at Olgiati's bank” 60. Also Milanese was Cardinal Francesco Alciati, elevated to the purple by Pius IV and closely connected with the Stampa family 61. In 1575 Morone had named him protector of his testamentary executors, but he died a few months before Morone, on 25 April 1580. The will provided that, “as a mark of honor,” he should receive “the gilded cup in which drink is carried to the said most illustrious testator” 62. Valuable objects were purchased by a certain Bernardino Ferrari, presumably a Lombard, and by the thoroughly Milanese Pietro Pusterla. A rich “pension of Modena” amounting to about seven hundred scudi a year was paid to Morone by the Odescalchi, while another pension of sixty scudi a year for the benefit of the “cardinal of Como,” Tolomeo Gallio, was charged against the income of the abbey of San Marziano in Tortona 63. Morone's other center of economic gravity remained Modena, which was also the home of Aurelio Stagno, one of his physicians, who in 1585 would serve as chief physician at the conclave that elected Sixtus V. The other physician mentioned in the so-called *Inventory of Morone's Goods*, Rodolfo Silvestri, who received his doctorate at Bologna in 1571, would become chief medical officer and conclave physician in the 1590s, as well as physician to Gregory XIV 64.

3. The Objects of Daily Life

The list of some of the goods that belonged to Morone conveys an image of a high standard of living free from ostentatious splendor. Few paintings adorned the walls of his Roman palace, all of religious subjects and all anonymous: a “picture in the form of a mirror containing figures of Saint Jerome printed on silk,” which the heir wished to take with him to Milan; a *Nativity*, sold for twelve scudi; a *Saint Michael the Archangel* for eight; a *Pietà* for a little more than two; and two paintings of the Madonna, one sold for fifteen scudi and the other for two and a half; a *Visitation*, evidently of good quality, bought by a secondhand dealer for a little more than twenty-five scudi; and “three old landscape pictures,” valued at one scudo each 65. There is no trace, by contrast, and certainly *pour cause*, of the portrait of Reginald Pole owned by Morone 66. Yet the cardinal paid a salary to Marcantonio da Casale, described - whether or not in the modern sense of the term is unknown - as his “house painter” 67, and traces survive of his dealings in art. In 1568, for example, he sold several antique sculptures to Cardinal d'Este for thirty-three scudi through the agency of the exceptionally faithful Marcantonio Villamarina, who had been arrested with him in 1557 and remained in his service until 1570 68. Mention has already been made of Morone's commission to Michelangelo around the mid-1550s for a *Christ Taking Leave of His Mother* 69, while it is unclear what Lomazzo meant when he recalled in verse that he had portrayed “Morone among the sacred cardinals, | with Crivelli, and many others whom I omit” 70.

Immediately after Morone's death, some of the objects, furniture, clothing, and household goods he owned were sent to the family's Milanese palace. These were items valuable in economic terms or significant to the family's identity and memory. They were packed into capacious chests and dispatched in three shipments, on 18, 20, and 30 January 1581 71. Among them were many pieces of silverware, always accompanied by their weight; blankets and fabrics of silk, damask, satin, velvet, and brocade; black silk sheets; various carpets, in keeping with the custom of covering tables; tasseled cushions; curtains; garments of every kind; doublets and fur accessories; seals; a few jewels; tapestries, conventionally regarded as second in value only to jewelry and works by great artists; leather wall hangings; “a small box containing two ivory crucifixes with ebony crosses”; and even “a featherbed of parrot feathers with a crimson satin cover” 72. Another portion of Morone's possessions was immediately put up for sale, bringing the heirs more than 9,284 scudi 73. Together with the 1,525 scudi found in cash, arrears of pensions, and several credits worth a total of 5,336 scudi 74, this sum was more than sufficient to settle the cardinal's debts. Particularly burdensome among them were more than 935 scudi owed to the Holy House of Loreto, paid into the hands of its protector, the cardinal-nephew Filippo Guastavillani, to settle an advance - received at an unspecified date - against a legacy from Naples; and 173 scudi owed to two apothecaries for medicines they had supplied 75. The estate also had to cover wages owed to servants and household expenses for the final months, and finally to honor testamentary bequests amounting altogether to about 6,500 scudi, to which must be added the 637 scudi “paid to the German College for the ring of the late lord cardinal of happy memory” 76. When Reginald Pole died in November 1558, that cardinal - whose institutional and political duties required a much higher standard of living and flow of expenditure than Morone's - kept in his house “about twelve thousand scudi in money and silver, and it seemed strange that a much larger sum was not found, since His Most Reverend Lordship had for several years collected the tithes and first fruits of that kingdom, which amounted to a fortune.” So Carnesecchi wrote to Giulia Gonzaga on 24 December of that year, adding in a letter of 13 February that “the inheritance, all told, amounts to about twenty-two thousand scudi” 77.

Among the less usual objects Giovanni Morone possessed at his death were a “salt stone for pains” and a “rhinoceros horn” made into a drinking cup, a “brass quadrant for measuring,” and a “serpentine base [...] for a cross”; an early “harpsichord”; “a small walnut cabinet with inlay”; and a valuable clock that the heir immediately decided to sell. The *Inventory* then lists no fewer than 949 pieces of “Fabriano leather,” which brought in more than 150 scudi; “a carriage rug, a foot-warming box, and a cover of Moorish cloth,” indispensable travel equipment; “Spanish gilt leather with silver borders” - embossed leather wall coverings, highly fashionable in Rome in the second half of the sixteenth century - sold for more than 139 scudi; and another leather hanging made from two hundred hides. There were six tapestries depicting a “stag hunt,” sold for just under forty-four scudi, and still more hangings of every kind: “with greenery and borders of pomegranates,” “with foliage and quince borders,” “six pieces with greenery,” “five pieces with greenery,” “six pieces with pale greenery,” “six pieces with greenery and borders of sirens,” “six pieces [...] with greenery and arabesque borders,” and seven pieces of “assorted unmatched foliage tapestry,” sold respectively for 48, 112, 79, 70, 93, 85, 100, and 57 scudi 78. The large quantity of worked-leather hangings, including pieces made locally, shows that this type of furnishing - fairly rare in the previous century and mostly imported from Spain - had become widespread by the second half of the sixteenth century 79.

These objects were invariably sold or taken to Milan by the designated heir, Girolamo Morone. In accordance with the late cardinal's wishes, the other nephew, Giulio, retained ownership of the Roman palace, but it was stripped of a great quantity of furniture and household goods, presumably those belonging to the reception rooms and the cardinal's private apartments. They included dozens of chairs upholstered in red leather, stools, beds, wardrobes, chests, tables, small tables, benches, boxes, “fire shovels,” twelve arquebuses, ten “Swiss-style corselets,” and twenty-seven pikes; “a hall clock with its case” and “an ancient Rome on paper”; two hundred pounds of “kitchen copperware,” with spits, tools, and iron implements of every kind for preparing food; pewter plates and jugs weighing 150 pounds; abundant majolica tableware; brass candlesticks; saltcellars; and no fewer than five “commode chairs,” four covered in red cloth and one in green, “with their copper chamber pots” - though one lacked its pot - sold for just over eight scudi altogether.

Cardinal Giovan Vincenzo Gonzaga of San Giorgio paid 202 scudi for the “Greek wine from Ischia” found in the cellar, and another 280 for “two mules and a litter with its fittings” 80.

The surviving documentation concerning Morone's estate ultimately provides a very detailed picture of the equipment needed by a large community devoted to serving a cardinal and the institutional roles incumbent upon a prince of the Church. On the one hand, it reveals an already advanced “vertical” organization of furniture - the system of wardrobes and cupboards characteristic of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which rendered obsolete the “horizontal” arrangement typical of Renaissance chests 81. On the other, one can glimpse the gradual accumulation in those trunks, wardrobes, and probably a few attics of furnishings, household objects, and clothes long fallen out of use, abandoned and now brought back into view to be bought cheaply by secondhand dealers capable of assigning value to everything. Chairs are extraordinarily numerous, as was typical of “noble and quasi-noble” domestic style throughout the seventeenth century and beyond 82, though there were also “two long benches and two pine tables used for the congregations” 83. And there emerges, it seems to us, that obsessive presence of purple objects - not only garments, but also wall hangings, chairs, ordinary household things, even the “commode chair” - which constantly reminded their user of his rank as a prince of the Church. What immediately stands out is the complete absence not only, and predictably, of the Milanese cardinal's private papers, but of any books whatsoever. This is scarcely credible when one recalls the inventory made of them at the time of his arrest on 31 May 1557 84. It clearly shows that the heirs had no intention of selling those books, perhaps not only because they wished to keep them in the family for future generations, but also to prevent them from falling into hostile hands and being scrutinized one by one. This confirms how alive and troubling the historical memory of Morone's inquisitorial trial remained at the time of his death. It is also significant that the only books mentioned by the cardinal in his will of 1575 were “his works of Saint Augustine,” destined for his great-nephew Giovanni Carlo, Giulio's son 85.

Disputes over succession involving property that had belonged to the cardinal were confronted by the next generation. Since Morone had established entail provisions through the male line, in 1616 the universal succession of Anna Morone Taverna, Girolamo's daughter, was challenged by the male agnates in a tangled lawsuit 86. The records show that the family preserved a clear memory of the objects that had belonged to their illustrious ancestor. During the dispute Anna was questioned by experts acting for the male relatives about the fate of “all those movable goods, a great quantity of furnishings, horses, mules, litters, carts, coaches, tapestries, silver or gilded vessels, worth more than ten thousand scudi,” formerly owned by her uncle and inherited by her father. A generation later, the fate of these objects had thus entered family memory, where the sale of many things that had belonged to Morone intersected with the heavy expenses he had incurred in the service of the Holy See. “He had been legate several times,” Anna Morone Taverna reminded the litigants on that occasion, “and such missions - as is well known - often impoverish even very wealthy cardinals and princes, who are frequently forced to go into debt” 87.

The dispute of 1616 also produced a list - highly revealing of the family's political sympathies - of the various “painted pictures” formerly owned by the cardinal's universal heir, his nephew Girolamo Morone, and kept between the family residence in Milan and the villa at Niguarda. In the city, amid various religious paintings, there hung six portraits of unidentified popes; five of governors of Milan, including the latest, the marquis of Hinojosa, portrayed with his wife; eight of unspecified members of the “Most Serene House of Austria”; twelve of members of the “House of Morone”; another twelve of “the twelve large emperors in the hall” and “twelve small emperors made on copper and framed in black frames”; and, beside them all, Solario's “portrait of the most illustrious lord grand chancellor Morone painted on panel.” At the country house the family instead kept portraits of Charles V and of his sister Mary, “queen of Hungary in gouache”; two of Philip II and Philip III; one of “the queen” consort Margaret of Austria; one of the “Most Serene Archduke Albert” - cardinal and prince of the southern Netherlands - and others of members of the “House of Austria in copper engravings,” as well as portraits of the count of Fuentes and Pietro Martire Ponzone, bishop of Novara. Also displayed at Niguarda were an effigy of Count Sforza Morone “in armor” and two portraits of the cardinal 88.

4. Historiography

Giovanni Morone himself took care, already during his lifetime, to transmit to posterity an image of himself placed under the sign of the solemn acquittal decreed by Pius IV in March 1560. That image had already partially taken hold after the death of Pius V, also because of the dreadful reputation left by Paul IV, whose hatred of Spain and the House of Austria made any defense of him impossible during the long age of the *pax Hispanica*, when the heirs of Charles V would rise to become the supreme guardians of the Counter-Reformation Church. Little help in understanding the past could come, moreover, from a thoroughly mediocre historical work such as the Corsican Antonfrancesco Cirni's *Comentarii*, published in 1573, which solved the problem by lavishing extravagant praise both on Paul IV, “full of zeal for religion and an enemy of cruelty and avarice,” and on Morone, whose “dexterity and prudence” had restored life to the Council, to the point that someone supposedly told him “he had come to raise a man four days dead” 89. Less cautious, also in 1573, was another historian and chronicler of his time, Mambrino Roseo, who repeated Panvinio's judgment that at the time of his election Carafa “was held in bad repute among the people at large and at court, because his actions were thought affected and savored of hypocrisy.” In Roseo's view, the extreme rigor of the inquisitorial repression he promoted “seemed to pass into cruelty,” as shown by “the prisons [...] all full” of the accused and by the hunt conducted against them “throughout every part of Italy” 90. “Many men are good men but not good princes,” he wrote, directing very harsh criticism at Paul IV, “a choleric and violent man” who always “inclined to the extreme of excess,” and “threw everything into turmoil, so that, having earned almost universal hatred, his death was as greatly desired as the life of Caesar Augustus had once been.” Explicit condemnation of the abuses of the Inquisition and its uncontrolled power was therefore accompanied by an equally explicit defense of Morone, “a man of irreproachable, modest life, adorned with many virtues, for which he was greatly loved by the people and the whole court.” Although nothing “of consequence” had been found against him, the pope, after imprisoning him “on suspicion of heresy,” “neither released him nor took care that his case should be concluded, though Morone himself and many cardinals pressed him to do so: and this caused the pope to become more hated by everyone, since the cardinal enjoyed so good a reputation” 91.

Soon afterward, in 1576, even a stern inquisitor such as Umberto Locati recorded with admiration in his *Italia travagliata* the success of the Genoese legation entrusted to Morone to restore concord in the troubled Ligurian republic 92. So too did the Franciscan Faustino Tasso in 1583, in his *Historie de' successi de' nostri tempi*, emphasizing Morone's “prudence,” “authority,” and great “worth” 93. That same year Florence saw the publication of Giovambattista Adriani's *Istoria de' suoi tempi*, which offered a highly negative judgment of Carafa. Adriani likewise drew on Panvinio in denouncing the hypocrisy with which Carafa had concealed his lust for power until, “having become pontiff, he wished to be crowned with great pomp and served by illustrious persons and barons; and in all his actions he displayed a lofty spirit and even greater arrogance, and very soon a great number of nephews and Neapolitan barons gathered around him.” “Greedy for dominion for his kin,” he had scandalously raised numerous relatives to the purple, among them Carlo Carafa, “a fierce man, more suited to any other occupation than to the life and office of a cleric; a restless and capricious person who, as a rebel bred to arms, delighted in turmoil and revenge” 94. Stressing the pope's complete dedication “to the affairs of the Inquisition,” Adriani deplored Morone's arrest on account of “certain articles of heresy with which he said that cardinal was stained,” and the revocation of Pole's English legation, “to the displeasure of the queen and the good men of the island, since by the good example of his life and learning he governed it, kept it under the authority and obedience of the Roman Church, and accomplished much good there” 95.

As we have seen, Cardinal Santoro recorded Morone's death in his terse autobiography with ill-concealed hostility and enduring suspicion 96. Very different in tone was the long funeral oration publicly delivered at Lodi a few weeks later, on 16 January 1581, by the boy Pietro Antonio Maldozzi, after composing it with the help of his tutor, Pietro Della Porta of Piacenza, an author of verse and numerous funeral orations as well as a *De sanctorum vitae et Lutheri discrepantia*, published at Pavia in 1570 97. Soon afterward the text of that public commemoration was printed in Milan *de licentia superiorum*. Its title page showed a pious bishop

seated on his cathedra in the act of blessing, wearing pallium, miter, and pastoral staff, flanked by two female figures bearing the palm of martyrdom and surrounded by the inscription TALES AMBIO DEFENSORES. Dedicated on 1 February to Anna Morone Stampa, the booklet celebrated Morone's family, education, studies, broad culture, and many virtues. It recounted his luminous ecclesiastical career, his numerous legations in Germany and Italy, his presidencies of the Council of Trent, his decisive role in forming the league against the Turk, and his great success in restoring concord at Genoa. It presented the edifying profile of an exemplary prelate “who had brought glory to the Christian religion,” both in governing the dioceses entrusted to him and in the delicate nunciatures and legations for which he had been responsible, as well as in his constant commitment to defeating heresy and safeguarding the faith of Rome 98. This was also reflected in the devout but highly improbable edifying speech at the point of death attributed to him by the author 99. Yet with ineffable nonchalance those verbose pages passed from the pontificate of Julius III to that of Pius IV, and from the legation to the Diet of Augsburg in 1555 to the Tridentine legation of 1563, without even naming Paul IV or devoting the slightest mention to the accusations of heresy, the long imprisonment in Castel Sant'Angelo, the trial, or the release. Only an allusive reference to “the troublesome slanders and other wickedness of the envious” 100 evoked the affair that was destined to weigh forever upon Morone's image. The young orator from Lodi preferred to consign it to a resounding silence, clear proof that the wound was still bleeding.

The Milanese cardinal's death transferred once and for all to the historical and historiographical plane the tangle of problems that had tightened around him throughout the entire Tridentine era, problems now acquiring different religious and political meanings. Hence the fading of his painful inquisitorial affair, also because every document capable of clarifying its premises, development, and significance was completely inaccessible. In the early seventeenth century Paolo Sarpi refrained from comment when recording both Morone's arrest “on certain indications [...] that in Germany he had some understanding” and his appointment by Pius IV to preside over the Council 101. Jacques-Auguste de Thou was equally terse, though more explicit. He placed the trial of this “man of great ability and seriousness” alongside Pole's contemporary deprivation of the English legation, describing Pole as a prelate “equaled by few in gravity and holiness of conduct - *morum gravitate ac sanctimonia* - wisdom, and learning” 102, after emphasizing how the severe rigor of Paul IV, from whom “some expected - and most feared - a reform of ecclesiastical discipline, was soon transformed into pride” 103. In the sphere of ecclesiastical erudition as well, drawing on Panvinio's *Lives*, the prevailing pro-Spanish orientation of the Roman court, and the now consolidated view of the Council of Trent as the founding moment of a renewed Catholic identity, there eventually emerged a historical memory of Morone as an exemplary prelate and a substantially negative judgment of Paul IV's pontificate, albeit expressed with all necessary caution. In 1609, for example, the Bolognese knight Giovanni Antonio Pietramellara continued the Veronese historian's work beginning precisely with Pope Carafa, evoking the unjust imprisonment of the Milanese cardinal whose full “innocence” Pius IV later acknowledged 104. Alfonso Chacón soon repeated this judgment word for word in his profiles of popes and cardinals 105.

Not everyone, however, was willing to swallow such harsh criticism without protest, beginning with those Theatines whose passionate vindication of their founder's glory drove them to become fierce defenders of his inquisitorial intransigence. To be sure, in the early seventeenth century the order's first historians - Giovan Battista Del Tufo, Giovan Battista Castaldo, and later Giuseppe Silos - offered their readers bloodless masterpieces of reticence 106. They took great care to conceal beneath the garments of their order's pious founder the unrestrained pontiff who had not hesitated to prosecute kings and emperors, bishops and cardinals for heresy. Their principal aim was to suppress every conflict within the Church and every tension that might in the past have threatened perfect harmony between Rome and Madrid. They therefore passed over in silence another *punctum dolens* in the historical memory of Paul IV: his visceral hatred of Spain and the absurd war he unleashed against Charles V and Philip II. This was best forgotten at a time when the Catholic monarchy was, and was increasingly about to become, the bulwark of Rome's faith against Protestants of every kind, Muslims, and Jews.

Their confrere Antonio Caracciolo held a different view. He wished to put his foot squarely into the dish of history and proclaim his truth in a voluminous *Vita et gesti di Giovanni Pietro Carafa*, whose hagiographic inspiration was nourished by so combative a polemical spirit that it ultimately prevented publication. The product of long and passionate research and knowledge of precious inquisitorial sources, the work painted a dark picture of mid-sixteenth-century Italy, where there was hardly “a principal city without some stain of heresy,” to the point that “in Rome itself there were nests of innumerable heretics,” while in Florence, “where those Machiavellis and Carnesecchis lived, scarcely a shred of Catholic faith remained.” This had been possible, the Neapolitan Theatine emphasized, partly because of the serious doctrinal errors committed by “many great prelates otherwise held to be good and wise, namely Cardinals Sadoleto, Morone, Pole, the archbishop of Otranto, the patriarch of Aquileia,” and many others. From this perspective he lost no opportunity to return above all to Pole and Morone, whom Paul IV had had the courage and merit to prosecute “on many serious counts of heresy,” in order to prevent the tiara from being placed on the head of subtle heretics “even though they sought in many ways to conceal themselves” 107.

The more his pen trembled in evoking those dark times, when the summit of the Church had risked plunging into the abyss of heresy, the less could what he wrote become public without provoking scandal, controversy, denials, and even condemnation by ecclesiastical authority. Antonio Caracciolo knew this very well and was himself compelled to profess the principle that “there is indeed a proper measure in what must be said and what must be left unsaid” - *est quippe dicendorum et tacendorum modus* - as he explained in his spare and anodyne Latin *Life* of Pope Carafa 108. There he devoted not the slightest reference to the divisions, conflicts, and clashes that had made the Roman curia their theater in the 1550s, drawing over them a thick veil of decorous silence and thus returning to the insipid current of the order's official historiography. After writing and rewriting his work, Caracciolo himself would also warn against excessive certainty - “of which there is little in the study of history” 109 - and argue that, on reflection, silence was preferable in matters too delicate to discuss. Otherwise scandalous information and untimely posthumous disputes might escape the enclosed world of inquisitors and Theatines, making historical truth too raw when it should instead be served to the uninitiated “cooked and seasoned so that they can digest it,” as Castaldo had theorized in 1611 110. *Nunc alia tempora, nunc alii mores*: the times and customs were now different. That voluminous vernacular *Life* would remain unpublished, intended to be read only in the refectories of Theatine houses during meals, as Caracciolo recommended in several manuscript notes.

In the end, however, he convinced himself that caution was required even there. After marking with special strokes of the pen certain passages that even his confreres would do well to ignore, he wrote a note in his own hand asking the order's archivists to show the work “only to certain of our brethren [...] privately and cautiously, because of the many sensitive matters contained here, more worthy of the archive than of print.” He indicated one by one the most delicate points that should not be read even at the devout Theatine table, among them “everything said about the trials of Cardinals Pole and Morone” 111. Caracciolo's call to arms, his battle in the name of a truth that had been crushed, and his full-blooded vindication of Pope Carafa's historical merits, sanctity, and providential role in establishing and then rigorously directing the Roman Holy Office were therefore destined to remain silent and hidden in the order's archives, swallowed by his own self-censorship. That self-censorship is entirely evident in the anodyne pages of the Latin *Life* of Pope Carafa published by Caracciolo in 1612 112, where every conflict falls silent, every accusation of heresy against illustrious cardinals disappears, and every historical problem dissolves into colorless apologetics. The author was forced to vent the frustrations of a militant Theatine and a historian obliged to conceal the truth only in the furious marginal notes he wrote in his own copy of the book: “Oh, if only I could write what I have read in the ancient manuscript sources!” 113. As has been observed, Theatine historians - both through such painful renunciations of proclaiming their own truth and through their celebration of the early spiritual renewal of Divine Love, the foundation of their order, its initiatives first in Venice and then in Naples, and the vigorous reform program Carafa set out in the famous memorial sent to Clement VII at the beginning of the 1530s - were “the first enthusiastic supporters of the idea that there had been a Catholic reform preceding and then accompanying Luther's Reformation” 114.

From the outset, in short, the historical judgment of Pole and Morone was a corollary of the judgment of Paul IV. As such, it placed the authority of the papacy on one side and that of the Council on the other under opposing pressures, with implications that were in any event embarrassing for the ecclesiastical institution. Such implications could no longer be evaded once controversy with the Magdeburg Centuriators gave way to political confrontation with the great works of Sarpi or de Thou, which made it impossible to entrust reconstruction of the past solely to cautious silences, ambiguities, and at times blatant falsifications in the devout holy cards manufactured by Theatines. Those great historians now viewed the Church from the perspective of the state, not the state from that of the Church. To avoid leaving them a monopoly over a history grounded in documents, nourished by problems, and animated by strong passions, it was necessary to have the courage to confront the effective reality of things, if only to cook and season them with sauces more nourishing and digestible than the hagiographic syrups served in the “private histories of the Theatine fathers.” This was the label applied with biting irony by the Jesuit Pietro Sforza Pallavicino in a long letter of 2 March 1658 to Gianluca Durazzo, ambassador of the Republic of Genoa in Paris, responding to the criticisms Theatines had raised against the two-volume *Istoria del concilio di Trento* he published in 1656-57 115. Pallavicino himself had written explicitly to Durazzo on 2 June of the previous year that the work was and wished to be nothing other than “an apology mingled with history: therefore everything that helps either to reject the adversary as ignorant or mendacious, or to establish my own credit as well informed, or to improve readers' opinion of those who governed the Church and managed the Council, is worthy of being described” 116. Precisely for that reason, however, he had to be credible, address the substance of the problems, reconstruct plausible histories, and formulate judgments, even if they were far from disinterested. There is no doubt that Pallavicino shared with the Theatine Giovan Battista Castaldo the principle that truth could not be told “so raw.” But times had changed, and the seasoning too had to change on the eve of the Peace of the Pyrenees, at a historical moment marked by the political collapse of Habsburg Spain and the Holy See's absolute political isolation, after it had not even been admitted a few years earlier to the negotiations that ended the Thirty Years' War.

For this reason too, the Jesuit cardinal, an authoritative member of an order cordially detested by the increasingly moribund and furious Theatines 117, did not hesitate to describe as “false” Pope Carafa's old suspicions against Pole and Morone. Carafa was “ardent in zeal and credulous of suspicions” 118. The only mitigating circumstance Pallavicino was willing to grant him was good faith - that he had not acted with a “slanderous spirit” - but it remained true that he had proceeded “against many persons of such distinction with imprudent zeal, publicly prosecuting them for a crime in which the mere accusation, without proof, is enough to stain the accused” 119. Though formally respectful, his judgment of Paul IV's reign was unequivocal. The pope was a man “of great religion,” “of the highest zeal, but not of perfect prudence,” “a generous estimator of himself and a narrow one of others, both in power and in wisdom,” a prisoner of narcissistic presumption that generated “great flattery in his presence but no less mockery in his absence.” His genuine religious commitment had nevertheless failed “to extinguish other impulses derived in him either from his homeland, his family, or his temperament,” such as “pomp more than ecclesiastical,” “excessive love of his blood and, within his kin, excessive esteem for titles and worldly grandeur,” an “elevated, impetuous, choleric manner of dealing, and a certain severity that seemed pride,” and hatred of the Spaniards and the House of Austria, whom he lost no opportunity to insult “with unseemly and unworthy names.” For this reason too, many of the otherwise commendable reforms he initiated “did not outlive their author,” Pallavicino concluded, while still crediting him with having created the Roman Inquisition, which “recognizes in his zeal its present vigor in Italy, and from which Italy recognizes the preservation of the integrity of its faith” 120.

Invested with a kind of historiographical officialdom, the Jesuit cardinal's work was now destined to become authoritative, despite the resentful *Difesa del gloriosissimo Paolo IV* by the Theatine Francesco Maria Maggi, who was moreover forced to hide behind a pseudonym 121. At the end of the century, for example, Louis Moréri's immensely learned *Grand dictionnaire historique* delivered a veritable hymn to Morone, “a man of great intelligence, able, resolute, and intrepid, but good and honest by nature,” attributing Paul IV's suspicions solely to those “envious” of his fairness. “It was impossible to understand how he had

dared to treat with such severity a prelate of Morone's worth, who had rendered great services to the Holy See and was worthy of rising to the summit of the Church," Moréri wrote. He nevertheless gave readers to believe that Pope Carafa had ultimately become convinced of Morone's innocence and had postponed absolution only "for fear of condemning himself," before concluding with a characteristically Counter-Reformation flourish that Morone "finally crowned the deeds of an illustrious life with a pious death" 122. Soon afterward Ferdinando Ughelli likewise recalled that Pius IV had decreed Morone's acquittal after a most careful examination in which all the accusations collapsed and his innocence finally triumphed 123. Praise for the Milanese cardinal also came from the German world, in an essay by the Protestant Johann Georg Fricke published in the *Amoenitates literariae* issued at Frankfurt between 1725 and 1731 by Johann Georg Schelhorn 124. Fricke recalled Morone's arrest ordered by Paul IV, "a severe and suspicious old man, as guilty of Lutheranism and a clandestine supporter of the Protestants"; the acquittal decreed by Pius IV; and his appointment to the Tridentine legation, in which "he spared no effort in favor of everything that seemed useful to establish and preserve with the greatest vigor the authority and absolute power of the Holy See," finally bringing that tormented Council to a conclusion. "From what we have said of him," Fricke concluded, "it is clear that he was a man of great intelligence, admirable ability, consummate skill in handling affairs, deeply devoted to the Roman pontiff, and that he always defended the latter's rights and preeminence tenaciously, even at the cost of damaging his own good name, not infrequently by cunning expedients and singular shrewdness" learned in his father's school.

Praise was all the more credible because it came from a Lutheran. It was consequently taken up by much eighteenth-century ecclesiastical erudition: by Odorico Rinaldi in his continuation of Cesare Baronio's *Annales ecclesiastici*, which recalled that at Pope Carafa's death Morone was confined in prison by the pope's will despite being innocent 125; by Girolamo Tiraboschi in the *Biblioteca modenese*, which repeatedly reaffirmed that innocence and declared that the accusations against him had no other basis than "the gentleness with which he believed heretics should be treated, thinking that this was a more suitable means of bringing them back into the bosom of the Church than the severity and tortures others wished to use" 126; by Lorenzo Cardella in the *Memorie storiche de' cardinali della santa romana Chiesa*, according to whom the Council of Trent "through his dexterity, prudence, and singular wisdom came to the happiest conclusion" 127; and finally in the hagiographic profile given in Gaetano Moroni's *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica* 128.

It seems appropriate to stop this summary historiographical profile here, since at a conference held in Trent Pierroberto Scaramella surveyed the historiography on the Milanese cardinal 129, beginning with the reassessment proposed by Fricke and then taken up by nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians, from Cesare Cantù to Federico Sclopis and Luigi Amabile, down to the most authoritative historian of the Council of Trent, Hubert Jedin, and, following him, the most recent modern biographer, Patrick Robinson 130. Despite being contradicted by many incisive studies 131, a confessionally inspired historiography - especially in the English-speaking world - still clings to a conventional and essentially rhetorical image of Catholic reform, whose apologetic implications are frankly unnecessary. But that is another problem, to be discussed in a more appropriate place.

Notes

I. “I Abandoned All the Affairs of My Household”: From the State to the Church

1. See below, section I.4.

2. Paolo Grillo, *Milano in età comunale (1183-1276). Istituzioni, società, economia*, Cisam, Spoleto 2001, pp. 203-4 and note 133, 225, 511; Alfredo Lienhard-Riva, *Armoriale ticinese*, Società araldica svizzera, Lugano 1945, p. 284.

3. Zanino Volta, *Di Bartolomeo Morone giureconsulto, maggiorente, cronista milanese, e della genealogia moronea*, in “Archivio storico lombardo,” XX (1893), pp. 433-692.

4. *Il libro di ricordi di Bartolomeo Morone, giureconsulto milanese (1412-1455)*, edited by Maria Nadia Covini, Unicopli, Milan 2010, p. 6; the seventeenth-century family archives still contained a *Libro del dottor Bartolomeo Morone anno 1427 al 33 di Niguarda e Bruzzano* (MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, reg. 311, f. 2r).

5. Beatrice Sironi, *Santa Maria della Scala nel Rinascimento milanese*, undergraduate thesis defended at the University of Milan, academic year 2006-2007, supervisor Prof. Rossana Sacchi, p. 163.

6. Stefano Meschini, *Uno storico umanista alla corte sforzesca. Biografia di Bernardino Corio*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1995, p. 59.

7. Beatrice Del Bo, *Banca e politica a Milano a metà Quattrocento*, Viella, Rome 2010, pp. 72, 89. The Milanese *pertica* was equivalent to about 655 square meters.

8. *Il libro di ricordi di Bartolomeo Morone*, cited above.

9. MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, file 1485, 8 September.

10. Guglielmo Enrico Saltini, *Girolamo Morone. Memoria storica*, in “Archivio storico italiano,” series III, VIII (1868), pp. 57-126, especially p. 66.

11. Francesco Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia*, edited by Silvana Seidel Menchi, 3 vols., Einaudi, Turin 1971, vol. III, p. 1646 (XVI, 8). Contemporary sources are almost unanimous in celebrating Morone's diplomatic skill in support of an autonomous state governed by a “natural” prince, which lay at the origin of his Risorgimento-era reputation. See *Lettere ed orazioni latine di Girolamo Morone*, edited by Domenico Promis and Giuseppe Müller, in “Miscellanea di storia italiana edita per cura della Regia deputazione di storia patria,” II (1863); *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica di Girolamo Morone*, edited by Giuseppe Müller, ibid., III (1865); *Disegno di Girolamo Morone*, in “Archivio veneto,” I (1871), pp. 1-3; G. E. Saltini, *Girolamo Morone*, cited above; Carlo Gioda, *Girolamo Morone e i suoi tempi*, Paravia, Turin 1887. The collection of unpublished documents relating to the years 1520-30, partly transcribed by Tullio Dandolo in *Ricordi inediti di Gerolamo Morone*, Boniardi-Polignani, Milan 1855, was the work of a nephew of Morone who bore the same name.

12. Alberto Aubert, *La crisi degli antichi Stati italiani*, Le Lettere, Florence 2003, and the collection of essays edited by Christine Shaw, *Italy and the European Powers. The Impact of War, 1500-1530*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2006.

13. Letizia Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” in DBI, vol. LXXVII, pp. 74-78; idem, *Esperimenti di governo: politica fiscale e consenso a Milano nell'età di Luigi XII*, in idem, *Milano e Luigi XII. Ricerche sul primo dominio francese in Lombardia (1499-1512)*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2002, pp. 255-339, especially pp. 267-68.

14. Stefano Meschini, *Luigi XII duca di Milano. Gli uomini e le istituzioni del primo dominio francese (1499-1512)*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2004.

15. Ugo Petronio, *Il Senato di Milano. Istituzioni giuridiche ed esercizio del potere nel ducato di Milano da Carlo V a Giuseppe II*, Giuffrè, Milan 1972.

16. Letizia Arcangeli, *Gentiluomini di Lombardia. Ricerche sull'aristocrazia padana nel Rinascimento*, Unicopli, Milan 2003.

17. Alessandro Cisieri, *Giardino istorico lodigiano, o sia Istoria sacro profana della città di Lodi e suo distretto*, nella Stampa di Giuseppe Matelli, Milan 1732, pp. 235-36.

18. François Menant, "Fissiraga, Antonio" and "Fissiraga, Bongiovanni," in DBI, vol. XLVIII, pp. 251-57; see Elide Mercatili Indelicato, *Per una storia degli Umiliati nella diocesi di Lodi. Le case di S. Cristoforo e di Ognissanti nel XIII secolo*, in Maria Pia Alberzoni, Annamaria Ambrosioni, and Alfredo Lucioni, eds., *Sulle tracce degli Umiliati*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1997, pp. 343-492, especially p. 424, notes 260, 261.

19. Franco Arese, *Le supreme cariche del ducato di Milano. Da Francesco II Sforza a Filippo V*, in "Archivio storico lombardo," XCVII (1970), pp. 1-100, see p. 83; L. Arcangeli, "Morone, Girolamo," cited above. The exchange rate between *livres tournois* - the official French currency throughout the ancien régime - and Milanese ducats in these years is taken from Guido Alfani, *Il Grand Tour dei cavalieri dell'Apocalisse. L'Italia del «lungo Cinquecento» (1494-1629)*, Marsilio, Venice 2010, p. 64, note 48.

20. See Girolamo Morone's will of 20 March 1516 in MiAS, Notarile, 3757.

21. Felice Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, 4 vols., Vallardi, Milan 1881, vol. II, Morone, table iii. The primogeniture acquired by Antonio, who was moreover always named with the comital title, is confirmed by an undated petition to the duke of Milan from the children and heirs of Girolamo Morone, which refers to Count Antonio and his brothers "de Moronis" (MiAS, Famiglie, 126, file *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo Morone*).

22. 25 January according to Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, 2nd ed., 8 vols., no publisher, Venice 1795-96, vol. VII/1, p. 478, followed by Nicola Bernabei, *Vita del cardinale Giovanni Morone vescovo di Modena*, Ditta tipografica Rossi, Modena 1885, p. 2, down to A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 15; 8 February according to Filippo Argelati, *Bibliotheca scriptorum mediolanensium*, 2 vols., in aedibus palatinis, Milan 1745, vol. II, col. 972, whose date was adopted by Pietro Verri's *Storia di Milano* and by *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, p. 285. See also the synopsis by Riccardo Fangarezzi, *Giovanni Morone. Una cronologia della vita*, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," series XI, XVII (1995), pp. 223-52.

23. Although historiographical tradition has accepted Girolamo Morone's recollection that his grandfather died leaving "four small sons with many debts," no sixteenth-century document known to us mentions other male children of Morone. They are also absent from the family tree published by Tullio Dandolo in *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, pp. 21-22, which he derived from a copy made by Gabriele Verri junior, Pietro's son, from a "precious manuscript volume" in his possession. These were probably documents collected by Pietro Verri for the *Storia di Milano*. Examination of the Verri archive at the Fondazione Raffaele Mattioli per la storia del pensiero economico has not located the original. Dandolo's family tree lacks dates of birth - identified by Arcangeli in the DBI entry cited above - and is considered unreliable by A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 14, note 2.

24. See below, section I.3; the information supplied by F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, tables iii-iv, is therefore inaccurate.

25. See below, section XXVII.2.

26. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 712-13, letter to Girolamo Castiglione of 8 May 1518. A distant relative of the historian Bernardino, Morone's son-in-law is not identified by S. Meschini, *Uno storico umanista*, cited above, p. 149, note 140.

27. See above, note 20.

28. See the entry “Moroni” at www.maltagenealogy.com. We partially correct here the genealogy presented in *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, pp. 21-22, and in L. Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” cited above. The marriage between Angela - sometimes erroneously recorded as Morani - and the marquis of Busseto, from whom ten children were born, is confirmed by Emilio Seletti, *La città di Busseto, capitale un tempo dello Stato Pallavicino*, Tipografia Bortolotti, Milan 1883, pp. 63-64, and Lidia Azzolini, *Palazzi e case nobiliari. L'Ottocento a Cremona*, Silvana, Milan 2001, p. 76.

29. See below, section IX.4.

30. On his estate, see Roberto Cara and Edoardo Rossetti, *Troso de Medici prospettico lombardo tra Monza e Milano*, in “Prospettiva,” nos. 126-27 (2007), pp. 115-27, especially pp. 117-18; L. Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” cited above.

31. Roberto Zapperi, “Botta, Bergonzio,” in DBI, vol. XIII, pp. 362-64.

32. ToAS, Paesi di nuovo acquisto. Oltre Po Pavese. Feudi Malaspina, 2, file 8, *Convenzione tra la dama Leonora Morona, figlia del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo, vedova del fu Gerolamo Botta [...], ed il marchese Cesare Malaspina d'Oramala, per forma della quale detta dama si è obligata di dare in paga al detto marchese Malaspina li luoghi di Fortunago [...]*, 26 June 1546. The amount of the dowry is given in Buonaventura De Rossi, *Istoria genealogica e cronologica delle due nobilissime case Adorna, e Botta*, per Giovan Gaetano Tartini, Florence 1718, p. 219, and in MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, file ca. 1546, which gives the date of Botta's death.

33. PM, vol. I, p. 506. Bergonzio was hired in 1569; see Anna Morone Stampa's letters to the Habsburg princess of 12 March and 12 September 1569 in NaAS, Carte farnesiane, 67, file XVII, ff. 309r-312v. He remained in her service until 1571, when he left “to Her Highness's great dissatisfaction, for she says that had she known, she would not have undertaken this effort; but in my judgment our masters have acted prudently in treating him well, since he is a nephew or relative of Cardinal Morone” (Giuseppe Bertini, *L'inventario di Margherita d'Austria*, Allemandi, Turin-London-Venice-New York 2012, p. 27, note 46).

34. MoAS, Carteggio di principi esteri, 1397/139.

35. MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, file *Testamento et primo codicillo della quondam signora marchesa di Soncino Anna Morone Stampa. Adì 30 ottobre 1583* (printed), f. 2r; ibid., file 1581, 3 June, Eleonora Morone's receipt to her nephew Girolamo, in which she appears as the widow, in her second marriage, of Vialardi. A manuscript copy of the marchioness of Soncino's will is in LuAMS, loose papers.

36. Rossana Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto. La politica artistica di Francesco II Sforza e di Massimiliano Stampa*, 2 vols., Led, Milan 2005, vol. II, p. 431.

37. Lodovico Domenichi, *La nobiltà delle donne*, appresso Gabriel Giolito di Ferrari, Venice 1549, pp. 268v-269r. On Domenichi, a member of the Piacenza academy who retained open heterodox sympathies even after his conviction at Florence for translating Calvin's *Excuse à messieurs les nicodémites*, see Enrico Garavelli, *Lodovico Domenichi e i «Nicodemiana» di Calvino. Storia di un libro perduto e ritrovato*, with a foreword by Jean-François Gilmont, Vecchiarelli, Rome 2004.

38. The inventory of her property is in MiAS, Notarile, notary Ambrosio Brusatori da Ferno, 25 September 1587; see R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. II, p. 646, note 26. Anna Morone died of suffocation on 27 July “after suffering from catarrh and fever for many days” (MiAS, Atti di governo. Finanza confische, 2019, file *Apprensione de beni del conte Massimiliano Gerolamo Morone*, f. 2r).

39. FiAS, Mediceo, 3103, f. 217rv, letter of 25 June 1552.

40. MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, *Testamento et primo codicillo della quondam signora marchesa di Soncino*, cited above, f. 7rv; R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. II, p. 476 and fig. 79. In several notarial deeds of the 1590s Girolamo is already cited as Moroni Stampa; see MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, file 1594, 27 January, though not in file 1596, 28 February.

41. The descendants' archives preserve a *Libro dei conti del signor cardinal Morone manegiati in Milano dalla signora marchesa di Soncino dal 1563 a tutto il 1580* (MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, reg. 311, f. 2r), while the Roman accounts were kept by the exceptionally faithful Pompeo Machiavelli. The archive in fact included a *Libro de conti del signor cardinal Morone manegiati da Pompeo Machiavelli da l'anno 1560 al 78* (ibid., f. 1v).

42. PM, vol. III, p. 121.

43. This appears to be the proper interpretation of the entry *Una lettera del cardinale di Trento governatore di Milano che scrive al Magistrato che, avendo la marchesa Morona dato uno memoriale in Spagna a Sua Maestà, che Sua Maestà domanda che li sia scritto il fatto per dar conto al re in Spagna*, dated 28 October 1556. See the long list of documents belonging to Anna Morone's personal archive, written in different hands and updated several times, in MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, reg. 310, file 1552, 21 June, unnumbered folios. Later letters summarized there show that the correspondence concerned the “affair and estate of Cusago” and that the “Magistrate” was the Extraordinary Magistracy.

44. L. Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” cited above.

45. In 1515 forty *pertiche* of vineyard known as “il Moscatello” at Cassano d'Adda were purchased for 1,200 lire (MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 90, file 1515, 28 April).

46. See Girolamo Morone's letter to the prior of Blenio of 5 October 1515 in *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, p. 457. A large part of Girolamo Morone's correspondence was reworked by him and is therefore considered unreliable by Paolo Prodi, *Relazioni diplomatiche fra il ducato di Milano e Roma sotto il duca Massimiliano Sforza (1512-1515)*, in “Aevum,” XXX (1956), pp. 437-94, and by A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, p. 58, note 69. Here, however, we shall use the correspondence to illuminate aspects of everyday family life, which were realistically less affected by additions and manipulation.

47. See Girolamo Morone's numerous petitions to friends and acquaintances asking for help in securing his son's release, among which the one addressed on 3 February 1516 to Florimond Robertet, councillor to Francis I, is particularly moving (*Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 478-81, 481-83, 486-89, 504-5, 509-11, 522-24, 537-38). Giangirolamo was released between the end of February and early March 1516 (ibid., p. 544).

48. Ibid., p. 549.

49. PM, vol. II, p. 1451. The file concerning confiscation of the property is in MiAS, Atti di governo. Finanza confische, 2018.

50. Both documents are preserved in MiAS, Notarile, 3757.

51. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 592, 669, letters of 12 May 1516 and undated; see also p. 601, the letter of the same 12 May to Visconti: “It was not love for my wife, my children, the fortunes of my country, and the other things judged precious that held me back - as you can see, I value all this very little - but the fear of suffering the collapse of my honor and the loss of my good name.”

52. See, for example, ibid., p. 557, the letter to Salvatico of 26 April 1516: “Remember that my wife, my children, and everything I possess are entrusted to your protection.” Salvatico, who had conducted the negotiations on the French side for Massimiliano Sforza's surrender to Francis I at Melegnano, died in June 1521 (Roberta Martinis, *L'architettura contesa. Federico da Montefeltro, Lorenzo de' Medici, gli Sforza e palazzo Salvatico a Milano*, Bruno Mondadori, Milan 2008, especially p. 48, note 60).

53. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 603, 613, letters of 13 May 1516 and undated.

54. We quote from the Leipzig edition, contemporary with those of Lyon and Venice, of [Ortensio Lando], *Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus. Dialogi festivissimi*, apud Michaelem Blum, Lipsiae 1534, pp. d[1]v ff.; see Conor Fahy, “The Composition of Ortensio Lando's Dialogue ‘Cicero relegatus et Cicero

revocatus,'" in "Italian Studies," XXX (1975), pp. 30-41. On Lando we refer simply to Simonetta Adorni Braccesi and Simone Ragagli, "Lando, Ortensio," in DBI, vol. LXIII, pp. 451-59.

55. See, for example, Girolamo Morone's letter of 18 February 1518 to the provost of Vienna, asking him to intercede with Emperor Maximilian I to obtain some office that would allow him "to provide for his wife, children, and large household" (*Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, p. 696).

56. Ibid., p. 613.

57. Ibid., pp. 613-14, letters of 4 November 1516.

58. Ibid., p. 618, letter of 12 November 1516.

59. Ibid., p. 734, letter of 17 August 1518. On the presence of the female members of the family at Modena, see also ibid., pp. 740-42, letter to Salvatico of 22 August 1518.

60. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 63.

61. See below, section I.2.

62. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 64-66 and note 208; on Sassi's heterodoxy, see Carlo Ginzburg, *Un letterato e una strega al principio del '500: Panfilo Sasso e Anastasia la Frappona*, in "Differenze," IX (1970), pp. 129-37.

63. See, for example, *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 208-9, letter of 23 July 1512.

64. PM, vol. II, pp. 1450-51. On the protection Guido Rangoni granted Sassi, see Girolamo Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese*, 6 vols., Società tipografica, Modena 1781-86, vol. V, p. 27.

65. PM, vol. I, pp. 537, note 11, 882, note 3, 903. G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, cited above, vol. VII/1, p. 478 - perhaps drawing on F. Argelati, *Bibliotheca scriptorum mediolanensium*, cited above, itself repeated in *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, p. 285 - mentions a lost letter from Morone to Reginald Pole in which Morone supposedly wrote that he was then in Padua studying *utriusque iuris*.

66. On her, see PM, vol. I, p. 636, note 20.

67. See below, section IV.5.

68. On him, see PM, vol. II, pp. 539, note 23, and 1348, note 154, with the bibliography cited there.

69. See *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 711-12, 717-19.

70. *Il libro di ricordi di Bartolomeo Morone*, cited above, p. 8; Maria Nadia Covini, "Morone, Bartolomeo," in DBI, vol. LXVIII, pp. 53-56. The parish was united in 1782 with Santo Stefano in Nosiggia. It was probably only after Gian Angelo de' Medici's appointment as cardinal in 1549 that his Milanese kin were able to display the Medici arms (Flavio Rurale, "Pius IV," in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, 3 vols., Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana, Rome 2000-2008, vol. III, pp. 142-60).

71. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 690-91, undated; the year can be deduced from the document cited in the following note. In the *Creatio Pii IV papae*, Onofrio Panvinio recalled - with differing emphasis in the various versions - Medici's birth "in the Porta Nuova quarter, in the district that today takes its name from the Morone [formerly from the Medici]. [...] After returning to his homeland he was admitted to the College of Jurists and for some time practiced law, [with much support from Girolamo Morone, patron of his family]" (CT, vol. II, p. 587).

72. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 713-14, letter of 26 April 1518.

73. See the decree of 17 April 1529 signed by de Leyva in *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, pp. 287 ff. On him, see Flavio Rurale, *L'ascesa dei fratelli Medici tra protagonismo militare e pratica cortigiana*, in *L'Italia di Carlo V. Guerra, religione e politica nel primo Cinquecento*, proceedings of the conference, Rome, 5-7 April 2001, edited by Francesca Cantù and Maria Antonietta Visceglia, Viella, Rome 2003, pp. 277-302.

74. The investiture document is in *La famiglia Moroni*, in "Archivio storico lombardo," I (1874), pp. 189-94.

75. F. Rurale, “Pius IV,” cited above.

76. *Lettere ed orazioni*, cited above, pp. 749-50, undated letters, and pp. 753-54, letter of 26 August 1518.

77. Ibid., pp. 788-89, a letter dated only to the year 1519 and based not on an autograph - unlike all the preceding ones - but on “a codex preserved in the library of Duke Scotti in Milan, containing copies of various writings concerning Morone's life from 1519 onward.” It therefore cannot be excluded that this was a later reworking intended to demonstrate Morone's loyalty to the House of Austria.

78. L. Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” cited above.

79. *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, p. 77.

80. L. Arcangeli, “Morone, Girolamo,” cited above.

81. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 312-16, letter of 5 December 1523. On the general context, see the fundamental studies by Federico Chabod, *Storia di Milano nell'epoca di Carlo V*, Einaudi, Turin 1971, and *Carlo V e il suo impero*, Einaudi, Turin 1985.

82. Boccadiferro - son-in-law of the governor of Pavia, Giacomo Gambaro - dated his meeting with Morone and the banquet “in the Maini house” to 1523 (PM, vol. II, pp. 1275-77; see pp. 903, 933). The reference to Girolamo Morone's “care of everything” comes from BoAS, *Lettere di diversi da Genova Milano Venezia e Lombardia al Senato. 1507-1553*, letter of Giacomo Gambaro, 1 September 1522.

83. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 316-18, document of 7 February 1524.

84. Ibid., pp. 320-32; see p. CXLVIII.

85. See below, section VI.1.

86. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, p. CI, note 1.

87. See the colorful account by Francesco Cazzamini Mussi, *La congiura di Girolamo Morone*, La Famiglia meneghina, Milan 1945.

88. In his account of the “Milan conspiracy,” Paolo Giovio attributed to the grand chancellor a compelling speech intended to persuade Pescara to become the “glorious champion of Italian liberty” - *italicae libertatis assertor gloriosus* (*Illustrium virorum vitae*, in officina Laurentii Torrentini, Florence 1551, p. 416). On Giovio's position, see Thomas C. Price Zimmermann, *Paolo Giovio. Uno storico e la crisi italiana del XVI secolo* [1995], Lampi di stampa, Milan 2012, pp. 107-11. Several letters to Francesco II Sforza show that the young Morone was in contact with Giovio (MiAS, Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni, letter of 3 February 1531; ibid., 30, letter of 13 March 1531).

89. See Marin Sanudo's chronicle of those convulsive hours (*Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 463-65).

90. Ibid., pp. 510-11, decree issued at Pavia on 27 October 1525.

91. Ibid., pp. 613-14, 619.

92. Ibid., pp. 584-85, Charles V's letter to Charles of Bourbon, 14 June 1526.

93. Ibid., pp. 609-10.

94. See *In funere illustrissimi cardinalis Ioannis Moroni comitis ad patritios populumque laudensem oratio habita a Petro Antonio Maldotio, puero decem annos nato, XVII. Cal. Februarii MDLXXXI*, apud Pacificum Pontium, Mediolani 1581, p. 5r, and the anonymous *Compendio della vita del cardinale Moroni* (MoBE, Fondo Campori, ms. γ.W.3.7, ff. 742r-744r, especially f. 742r): both texts state that the future cardinal was only sixteen years old at the time.

95. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 622-23, Gregorio Panigarola's letter to Francesco II Sforza, 29 November 1526. For the political role of Clement VII in this phase, see Maurizio Gattoni, *Clemente VII e la geo-politica dello Stato pontificio (1523-1534)*, Archivio segreto vaticano, Vatican City 2002.

96. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 624-25, letter of 10 December 1526.

97. As Morone himself would later write to Charles V (ibid., pp. 676-77, undated).

98. Ibid., p. 614, letter of 21 November 1525. The information is confirmed by Guicciardini's letter to Giberti of 25 December: “From Milan we have two reports that Morone, after paying fifteen thousand scudi [sic] and spending several days familiarly in San Marco, which is Bourbon's lodging, has been returned to the castle, and that they are demanding further money from him” (Francesco Guicciardini, *Carteggi*, 17 vols., Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Rome 1938-72, vol. XI, p. 169).

99. PM, vol. I, pp. 489-90.

100. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Moroni, table III, erroneously says that he died in 1539.

101. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 644-45, Charles of Bourbon's letter to the castellan of Milan, 16 March 1527.

102. Ibid., pp. 646-48.

103. Ibid., pp. 625 ff.

104. Ibid., pp. 636-37, letter sent to Francesco II Sforza from Parma on 18 February 1527 by Ennio Filonardi, then papal legate with the Swiss troops he had recruited for the Venetian-papal army; on him, see Rotraud Becker, “Filonardi, Ennio,” in DBI, vol. XLVII, pp. 819-26.

105. *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, p. 230; Girolamo was the son and heir of Sforza Morone.

106. See Lorenzo Tacchella, “Il cardinale Giovanni Morone vescovo di Tortona nel 1527,” in “Julia Dertona. Bollettino della Società per gli studi di storia, economia ed arte nel Tortonese,” XXXV (1986), pp. 105-7, and “Il pontefice Clemente VII revoca il provvedimento apostolico dell'elezione di Giovanni Morone a Vescovo di Tortona,” ibid., XXXVI (1987), pp. 159-64, to be supplemented and corrected by Sergio Pagano, *Il cardinale Uberto Gambara vescovo di Tortona (1489-1549)*, Olschki, Florence 1995, pp. 35-36, note 113.

107. MoAS, Carteggio principi esteri, 1169/A, file 1.

108. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 716-17, letter from Naples of 7 March 1529; Giuseppe Pistoni, “Il cardinale Giovanni Morone, cittadino di Modena,” in “Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi,” series X, III (1968), pp. 29-49, especially p. 32.

109. See below, section I.4.

110. *Ricordi inediti*, cited above, p. 293.

111. PM, vol. II, pp. 1277, 1456.

112. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, p. 403, note 45.

113. A letter from Morone dated Rome, 6 January 1531, states that one of his relatives, formerly “in the service” of Sforza, had “gone to Naples to see whether records could be found of the money he previously mentioned to Your Excellency, and also to obtain a copy of the will of my late father of happy memory; in both matters he has returned without result” (MiAS, Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni).

114. PM, vol. II, p. 1064.

115. Ibid., p. 1103.

116. Ibid., pp. 122-23, Alessandro Olocati's letter to Giovanni Morone, 9 August 1559.

117. Ibid., pp. 1101-2.

118. Ibid., pp. 1283-84: “His Most Excellent Lordship the duke always showed that he held him in such esteem for as long as His Excellency lived, because he constantly made use of him, sending him now as nuncio or ambassador to the Holy See in the time of Paul III, now to other lords on other business of his.”

119. Massimo Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo vescovo ed eretico. Riforma della Chiesa e Inquisizione nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2006, p. 56.

120. Ada Ferrari, "Una religione feriale. Aspetti e momenti del cattolicesimo ambrosiano dall'Unità agli anni Settanta," in *Storia d'Italia. Le regioni dall'Unità ad oggi. La Lombardia*, edited by Duccio Bigazzi and Marco Meriggi, Einaudi, Turin 2001, pp. 435-77.

121. Federico Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa a Milano nell'epoca di Carlo V*, Einaudi, Turin 1971, p. 283. On the Sforza precedents, see Francesco Somaini, "La «stagione dei prelati del principe»: appunti sulla politica ecclesiastica milanese nel decennio di Galeazzo Maria Sforza (1466-1476)," in Carlo Capra and Claudio Donati, eds., *Milano nella storia dell'età moderna*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 1997, pp. 7-63.

122. William V. Hudon, *Marcello Cervini and Ecclesiastical Government in Tridentine Italy*, Northern Illinois University Press, DeKalb 1992, p. 15: "The humanists [Contarini, Pole, Sadoleto, Morone, Cervini] were aware of clerical practices and criticized them, but they were also convinced that a genuine reform of the hierarchy was possible and that such a hierarchy was still the best instrument for promoting any reform throughout the Church."

123. PM, vol. I, pp. 426, 452.

124. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 266-67.

125. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 12.

126. Pablo Fernández Albaladejo, "De «llave de Italia» a «corazón de la monarquía»: Milán y la monarquía católica en el reinado de Felipe III," in Paolo Costantino Pissavino and Gianvittorio Signorotto, eds., *Lombardia borromaica Lombardia spagnola*, 2 vols., Bulzoni, Rome 1995, vol. I, pp. 41-91.

127. Gigliola Fragnito, "Istituzioni ecclesiastiche e costruzione dello Stato: riflessioni e spunti," in idem, *Cinquecento italiano*, cited above, pp. 17-66, especially pp. 19-20.

128. Enrico Cattaneo, "Istituzioni ecclesiastiche milanesi," in *Storia di Milano*, 18 vols., Fondazione Treccani degli Alfieri per la Storia di Milano, Milan 1953-95, vol. IX, pp. 507-721, especially pp. 563 ff.

129. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 274, 278.

130. See above, section I.3, and the text of the defensive articles submitted by Morone on 18 August 1559 (PM, vol. II, p. 146). From Girolamo Rovelli's testimony we learn that the appointment as senator had been decreed by Francesco II Sforza after Morone's election as bishop, and therefore in the 1530s (ibid., p. 933).

131. Ibid., p. 792.

132. MiAS, Famiglie, 126, file *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo Morone*.

133. Ibid., Autografi, 30.

134. Pole, *Epistolae*, vol. IV, p. 174. In the same letter he asked for assistance in obtaining the office of Milanese fiscal advocate for Scipione, brother of Ludovico Simonetta.

135. Paolo Morigia, *La nobiltà di Milano divisa in sei libri*, nella stamperia del quondam Pacifico Pontio, Milan 1595, pp. 71-72.

136. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 300; Ottavia Niccoli, *Profeti e popolo nell'Italia del Rinascimento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1987, pp. 153-54.

137. Claudia di Filippo Bareggi, "The Reformation and the Catholic Revival in the Borromeo's Age," in Andrea Gamberini, ed., *A Companion to Late Medieval and Early Modern Milan. The Distinctive Features of an Italian State*, Brill, Leiden 2015, pp. 93-117, especially pp. 97-99. On Savonarola as a precursor of the Lutheran Reformation, see Luigi Lazzerini, *Teologia del Miserere. Da Savonarola al «Beneficio di Cristo» 1490-1543*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Turin 2013; Adriano Prosperi, *L'eresia del Libro Grande. Storia di Giorgio Siculo e della sua setta*, Feltrinelli, Milan 2000, p. 22.

138. See Grado Giovanni Merlo, "Menes Silva, Amadeo de," in DBI, vol. LXXIII, pp. 461-63.

139. PM, vol. I, p. 1279.

140. Massimo Firpo, “Paola Antonia Negri da «divina madre maestra» a «spirito diabolico»,” in “Barnabiti studi,” VII (1990), pp. 7-66; later in idem, *«Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede». Studi sulla vita religiosa nel Cinquecento italiano*, Unicopli, Milan 2003, pp. 67-120; Elena Bonora, *I conflitti della Controriforma. Santità e obbedienza nell'esperienza religiosa dei primi barnabiti*, Le Lettere, Florence 1998; Claudia di Filippo Bareggi, “Fra' Battista da Crema e Giampiero Besozzi: le prime comunità paoline milanesi,” in Alberto Rocca and Paola Vismara, eds., *Prima di Carlo Borromeo. Istituzioni, religione e società agli inizi del Cinquecento*, Biblioteca Ambrosiana-Bulzoni, Milan-Rome 2012, pp. 203-42; Gabriella Zarri, “Profezia politica e santità femminile in Santa Marta: un modello,” ibid., pp. 187-202; idem, *Le sante vive. Profezie di corte e devozione femminile tra '400 e '500*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Turin 1990.

141. Angelo Bianchi, “Le Scuole della dottrina cristiana: linguaggio e strumenti per una azione educativa «di massa»,” in Franco Buzzi and Danilo Zardin, eds., *Carlo Borromeo e l'opera della «Grande Riforma». Cultura, religione e arti del governo nella Milano del pieno Cinquecento*, Amilcare Pizzi-Silvana editoriale, Cinisello Balsamo 1997, pp. 145-58.

142. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 254 and note 1, 256.

143. Ibid., pp. 257-58, 262. The canons of the Scala were moreover the ecclesiastics who most fiercely opposed Carlo Borromeo's work.

144. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 302.

145. Ibid., p. 305.

146. Ibid., p. 330, note 4. On the Stampa, see R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 416-17; Edoardo Rossetti, “Uno spagnolo tra i francesi e la devozione gesuata: il cardinale Bernardino Carvajal e il monastero di San Girolamo in porta Vercellina a Milano,” in Frédéric Elsig and Mauro Natale, eds., *Le Duché de Milan et les commanditaires français (1499-1521)*, Viella, Rome 2013, pp. 181-235; idem, “«Arca marmorea elevata a terra per brachia octo». Tra sepolture e spazi sacri: problemi di memoria per l'aristocrazia milanese del Rinascimento,” in Letizia Arcangeli, Giorgio Chittolini, Federico Del Tredici, and Edoardo Rossetti, eds., *Famiglie e spazi sacri nella Lombardia del Rinascimento*, Scalpendi, Milan 2015, pp. 169-227.

147. Massimo Firpo, *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2016, p. 108.

148. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 313-14.

149. PM, vol. I, p. 601.

150. Brief of 26 June 1536 published in Bartolommeo Fontana, “Documenti vaticani contro l'eresia luterana in Italia,” in “Archivio della società romana di storia patria,” XV (1892), pp. 71-165, 365-474, especially p. 151.

151. Ibid., p. 152, letter of 12 July 1536 beginning: “Since, as we have learned, the aforesaid bishop of Modena is not in Milan, as we had been informed, but in Modena...”

152. On Battista da Crema, besides Sosio Pezzella, “Carioni, Battista,” in DBI, vol. XX, pp. 115-18, see Massimo Firpo, *Nel labirinto del mondo. Lorenzo Davidico tra santi, eretici, inquisitori*, Olschki, Florence 1992, pp. 19-20; E. Bonora, *I conflitti della Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 121 ff.

153. PM, vol. II, p. 954.

154. Ada Grossi, “L'ostensione milanese della sindone: 7 maggio 1536,” in “Aevum,” LXXXVII (2013), pp. 783-806, especially p. 787. The attribution to Gaudenzio Ferrari of the drawing depicting a display of the Shroud in the first half of the sixteenth century, now in the Pinacoteca of Varallo Sesia, has been superseded; for Elena Rame's catalogue entry, see Carla Falcone, ed., *Arti figurative in Valsesia. I disegni della Pinacoteca di Varallo*, Eventi & progetti, Biella 2008, p. 46. Since Ferrari died in Milan in 1546, that attribution would have implied that one of the three ordinaries shown there was Giovanni Morone.

155. A. Grossi, “L'ostensione milanese,” cited above, pp. 798-99, denies any connection between the Barnabites and the display of 1536.

156. See PM, vol. II, pp. 121-29, especially p. 124. Bono was a simple layman, although several chroniclers and Morone himself regarded him as a member of a religious order. It should be noted that the inquisitor general of Milan, the Dominican Melchiorre Crivelli, maintained close ties from the early 1530s with the Barnabites and Paola Antonia Negri, authorizing the printing of Battista da Crema's works (Agostino Borromeo, “Il domenicano Melchiorre Crivelli inquisitore e vescovo «suffraganeo» di Milano (1486?-1561),” in “Studia borromaica,” IX (1995), pp. 49-64). On Basilio Ferrari, see PM, vol. II, p. 206, and the bibliography cited there.

157. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 273.

158. Among those who emphasize a direct link between the marquis del Vasto's protest and the birth of the Holy Office are Adriano Prosperi, “Per la storia dell'Inquisizione romana,” in *L'Inquisizione romana in Italia nell'età moderna. Archivi, problemi di metodo e nuove ricerche*, proceedings of the international seminar, Trieste, 18-20 May 1988, edited by Andrea Del Col and Giovanna Paolin, Ministero per i Beni culturali e ambientali, Rome 1991, now in idem, *L'Inquisizione romana. Letture e ricerche*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2003, pp. 29-68, especially p. 55; and Giovanni Romeo, *L'Inquisizione nell'Italia moderna*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2009, p. 3.

159. Germano Maifreda, *I denari dell'inquisitore. Affari e giustizia di fede nell'Italia moderna*, Einaudi, Turin 2014, p. 149.

160. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 462. Morone included Arrigoni in the list of defense witnesses (PM, vol. II, p. 214). On the Cremona affair, see below, section XI.4.

161. *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 649-57.

162. We refer simply to André Chastel, *Il sacco di Roma 1527*, Einaudi, Turin 1983; Massimo Firpo, “Il sacco di Roma del 1527 tra profezia, propaganda politica e riforma religiosa,” in idem, *Dal sacco di Roma all'Inquisizione. Studi su Juan de Valdés e la Riforma italiana*, Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria 1998, pp. 7-60; Massimo Miglio, Vincenzo De Caprio, Daniel Arasse, and Alberto Asor Rosa, *Il sacco di Roma del 1527 e l'immaginario collettivo*, Istituto nazionale di studi romani, Rome 1986.

163. Carlo Dionisotti, *Geografia e storia della letteratura italiana*, Einaudi, Turin 1967, pp. 47-75.

164. Massimo Firpo, “Morone, Giovanni,” in DBI, vol. LXXVII, pp. 66-74.

165. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 33.

166. PM, vol. II, pp. 1130, 1147. “I was then fourteen or fifteen years old” (ibid., vol. I, p. 484); “I had a friendship with Soranzo, bishop of Bergamo, which friendship went back to Padua in 1524, when I went there to study” (ibid., p. 468). See *In funere illustrissimi cardinalis Ioannis Moroni*, cited above, p. 5r, which states that he “received the degree in civil law at that time” - *iuris civilis laurea donatus sit eo tempore* - although he probably did not take a doctorate.

167. MiBA, ms. O 231 sup., f. 1r.

168. Giovanni Della Casa, *Vita di Pietro Bembo*, edited by Claudio Piga and Giancarlo Rossi, Nino Aragno, Turin 2016, p. 68.

169. PM, vol. I, p. 468. Morone was moreover the godson of Margherita Pio Sanseverino, daughter of Marco II Pio, lord of Carpi, who was succeeded by Lionello II, the cardinal's father (ibid., vol. II, p. 1590).

170. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 882, 884, 903, 1130-31.

171. Morone would say that he had met Soranzo “in Padua, in the year 1524 or 1525, [...] where I then was, and there I first came to know him. [...] I was then fourteen or fifteen years old, and we never discussed matters of faith” (ibid., vol. I, p. 484; see M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, p. 33).

172. John Edwards, *Archbishop Pole*, Ashgate, Farnham-Burlington 2014, p. 11.

173. Morone and Pole's acquaintance in those years is treated as certain by T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, p. 50.

174. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 76; on the plague, see Gino Franceschini, “Le dominazioni francesi e le restaurazioni sforzesche,” in *Storia di Milano*, cited above, vol. VIII, pp. 81-333, especially p. 299.

175. M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 38-41.

176. MiAS, Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni; see also the letter of 18 January there.

177. See ibid., letters from Rome of 4 February and 12 April 1531.

178. In a letter of 4 February Morone wrote: “In recent days the bishop of Todi [Federico Cesi], brother of Cardinal [Paolo Emilio] Cesi, joking about the affairs of my bishopric, asked whether I wished to make an arrangement over it, saying he could find a man who would give me a good exchange. I replied that I would be grateful. He later came back to me and in earnest asked whether I wished to exchange with his brother the cardinal, who wanted [...] to have the bishopric of Cervia given to me” (ibid.). After his appointment as cardinal in 1544, Cesi did in fact exchange the diocese of Todi with his cousin Giovanni Andrea for that of Cervia (Agostino Borromeo, “Cesi, Federico,” in DBI, vol. XXIV, pp. 253-56).

179. MiAS, Famiglie, 126, file *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancellier Gerolamo Morone*.

180. See, for example, in *Documenti che concernono la vita pubblica*, cited above, pp. 718-19, 721 - from which the quotation is taken - and 724, the ducal decrees of 9 and 14 February, 22 April 1531, and 10 March 1536.

181. Ibid., p. 720, Amabilia Fissiraga's letter to the duke of Milan, 17 April 1531.

182. MiAS, Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni, letter of 12 April 1531.

183. Paolo Morigia, *Historia dell'antichità di Milano*, appresso i Guerra, Venice 1592, p. 65; A. Lienhard-Riva, *Armoriale ticinese*, cited above, p. 284.

184. L. Domenichi, *La nobiltà delle donne*, cited above, p. 269r.

185. MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 90, file 1557, 22 April. The gift, consisting essentially of landed property at Rovederio in the Lodigiano, prevented Sforza from alienating the property received without the consent of his mother Amabilia, who was still alive at the time (LuAMS, 4, file M9, 1, f. 4r).

186. As shown by a document preserved in MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, reg. 320, f. 10r, which refers to the inventory of his property ordered by the heir Girolamo on 4 September of that year.

187. He is described as Sforza's “only legitimate natural-born male son” in MnAS, *Testamento et primo codicillo della quondam signora marchesa di Soncino*, cited above, f. 2v, which named him universal heir and established an entail over the estate. His death without legitimate male heirs would lead at the beginning of the seventeenth century to the reversion of the fief of Pontecurone to the Camera (P. Morigia, *Historia dell'antichità di Milano*, cited above, p. 655).

188. See MnAS, *Testamento et primo codicillo della quondam signora marchesa di Soncino*, cited above, f. 11r, which certifies his status as a “natural son” of Sforza Morone; he died in 1603 (ibid., Casati Stampa di Soncino, 69, file 1618, 6 April).

189. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, table iii.

190. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, p. 37, note 33.

191. See, for example, a passage from the letter of 13 March 1531: “Much is again expected, but we have nothing certain. It is said that Our Lord will resolve to make two cardinals at the emperor's request, though His Holiness will do so unwillingly. The bulls for the tithes to provide aid against the Turk will soon be issued; I fear he will be somewhere in Italy. Your Excellency will have heard of the plot discovered in Corsica to give certain ports to these corsairs who raid every day at the gates of Naples and here at the mouth of the Tiber. Affairs in Siena remain in their usual confusion, and inside they are strengthening themselves

with defenses and men; nevertheless it is hoped that this journey of the marquis del Vasto [Alfonso d'Avalos] will bring them to an agreement. Nothing is said of an accord with Ferrara, because extreme hardness is seen on every side, although the imperial ministers press strongly for it" (MiAS, Autografi, 30; see also ibid., Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni, letter of 18 January 1531).

192. Ibid., Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni.

193. See below, section II.6.

194. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 33-34; Massimo Carlo Giannini, "Ippolito II d'Este arcivescovo di Milano fra interessi familiari e scelte politiche (1535-1550)," in A. Rocca and P. Vismara, eds., *Prima di Carlo Borromeo*, cited above, pp. 107-20. It may have been in consequence of the financial implications of the agreement that Morone began at this time to keep written accounts, including a now-lost *Libro di diverse entrate del [...] 1531*, listed in the register of family documents in MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, reg. 311, f. 2r.

195. Elena Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore. Principi italiani tra il papa e Carlo V*, Einaudi, Turin 2014, p. 50.

196. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 77. The already cited *Compendio della vita del cardinale Moroni* states that it was his conduct during the siege of Florence that earned the pontiff's esteem, when he entered the city "on certain business of His Beatitude, who was very satisfied with him in this matter" (MoBE, Fondo Campori, ms. γ.W.3.7, f. 742r).

197. Benvenuto Cellini, *La vita*, edited by Giuseppe Guido Ferrero, Utet, Turin 1965, p. 164 (I, 45).

198. Gerolamo Perbono, *Oviliarum opus luculentissimum et elegantissimum*, Vincentius Medda, Milan 1533, *Epistolarum liber quartus*, p. Vr.

199. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 77.

200. PM, vol. I, p. 529 and note 38; see M. Firpo, *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma*, cited above, p. 45.

201. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 267.

202. See above, section I.3.

203. Michele Luzzati, "Carnesecchi, Andrea," in DBI, vol. XX, pp. 465-66, which nevertheless does not mention his Milanese experience; see Oddone Ortolani, *Per la storia della vita religiosa italiana nel Cinquecento. Pietro Carnesecchi*, Le Monnier, Florence 1963, p. 2.

204. F. Guicciardini, *Carteggi*, cited above, vol. XII, pp. 75, 90.

205. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, p. 57, note 68.

206. See below, section II.1, and the letter of 26 January 1535 to Francesco II Sforza published in *La famiglia Moroni*, cited above, p. 190.

II. "An Honorable Concord": The First Nunciatures and the Experience of the German Reformation

1. MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, file I, f. 13r.

2. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 282, letter to the papal secretary Girolamo Dandino, 7 September.

3. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. I, p. 37, note 33. Morone had reached Milan toward the end of February, carrying a letter from Paolo Giovio to the duke with news of the Roman court (P. Giovio, *Lettere*, cited above, vol. I, p. 143), and departed for Modena on 14 March of that year, returning to Milan on 14 April. By August, however, he was again in Modena, which he left once more toward the end of September. See Morone's letters to the duke, all from 1535, dated Milan, 13 March and 18 April; Modena, 21 and 29 August; Bologna, 27 October; and Florence, 1 November. The first and penultimate are in MiAS, Famiglie, 126, file *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo Morone*; the others in ibid.,

Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni. See Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 11-13; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 72.

4. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. I, p. 49, note 66.

5. MiAS, Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni, letter of 26 January 1535; ibid., Famiglie, 126, file *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo Morone*, letter from Florence of 1 December 1535; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 87-88.

6. MiAS, *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancelliere Gerolamo Morone*, draft of 6 February 1535.

7. Ibid., Autografi, 45, file Giovanni Moroni.

8. Ibid., letter of 28 January 1535.

9. NB1, vol. I, p. 1.

10. PM, vol. II, p. 147.

11. Ibid., vol. I, p. 489; see vol. II, pp. 146-47.

12. NB1, vol. II, pp. 266-68; NBM, pp. 102-3.

13. NB1, vol. I, p. 62.

14. Ibid., *1. Ergänzungsband 1530-1531*, p. 32. On him, see Claudio Centa, *Una dinastia episcopale nel Cinquecento: Lorenzo, Tommaso e Filippo Maria Campeggi vescovi di Feltre (1512-1584)*, 2 vols., Edizioni liturgiche, Rome 2004, vol. I, pp. 162 ff.; and in general, also for what follows, Pastor, vol. IV/1, pp. 370 ff.; Émile G. Léonard, *Storia del Protestantesimo* [1961], 4 vols., il Saggiatore, Milan 1971, vol. I, pp. 299 ff. On Aleandro, also for what follows, see Volker Reinhardt, *Lutero l'eretico. La Riforma vista da Roma*, Marsilio, Venice 2017.

15. NB1, *2. Ergänzungsband 1532*, pp. 457-60.

16. Ibid., p. 464; see pp. 469-71.

17. Ibid., *1. Ergänzungsband 1530-1531*, p. 38.

18. Ibid., p. 70.

19. Ibid., p. 90.

20. Ibid., p. 106.

21. Ibid., p. 254.

22. Ibid., p. 349.

23. Ibid., p. 462.

24. Ibid., p. 400.

25. Ibid., *2. Ergänzungsband 1532*, p. 369.

26. Ibid., p. 391.

27. Ibid., p. 183.

28. Ibid., p. 153.

29. NB1, vol. I, p. 171; see Jedin, vol. I, pp. 305 ff.

30. Pastor, vol. V, pp. 29 ff.; Carlo Capasso, *Paolo III (1534-1549)*, 2 vols., Principato, Messina 1923-24, vol. I, pp. 342 ff. There is an unobtainable monograph on the *Consilium* by Alberto Aubert, *Il «Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia». Riforma della Chiesa e propaganda religiosa nel Cinquecento*, Philos, Rome 2008.

31. Lancillotti, vol. VI, p. 187; see p. 221.

32. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 588.

33. CT, vol. IV, pp. 54, 57.

34. PM, vol. I, p. 410.

35. Ibid., pp. 444-45; see vol. II, pp. 175-76. Gasparo Contarini too, in a letter from Regensburg of 13 March 1541, would write that “for many years he had recognized in me a supreme desire that these discords should be removed and the Church restored to its pristine unity; therefore His Beatitude hoped that God, the author of every good, just as he had given me this desire, would also give me the strength to carry it out” (Viktor Schultze, “Dreizehn Depeschen Contarini's aus Regensburg an den Cardinal Farnese (1541),” in “Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,” III (1879), pp. 150-84, especially p. 153).

36. NB1, vol. II, p. 120; see his letter to Ambrogio Recalcati of 17 December 1536, in which “with shame and sorrow” he informed him of his dramatic financial situation, having already pledged the entire income of the diocese of Modena for the following year as well. Therefore, “being unable to dispose of the patrimony, most of which is in the hands of creditors and of my two brothers, who live on the remainder,” and being unable to incur further debts, he begged the pope either to increase his “allowance,” as promised, or to replace him (PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 87; see also the letter of 28 December there).

37. Hugo Laemmer, *Meletematum romanorum mantissa*, typis et sumptibus Georgii Josephi Manz, Ratisbonae 1875, p. 148.

38. NB1, vol. II, p. 83; see Jedin, vol. I, p. 366.

39. NB1, vol. II, p. 93; see pp. 158-59.

40. Ibid., p. 221.

41. Ibid., pp. 234-35; see pp. 227-29, 244.

42. Ibid., pp. 252-53; see p. 308.

43. Jedin, vol. I, p. 375, whose judgment was adopted by Peter Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1972, p. 13.

44. NB1, vol. IV, p. 405.

45. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 146, 172-73; PM, vol. II, pp. 245-47.

46. PM, vol. I, pp. 248-49.

47. NB1, vol. II, p. 148. “His Holiness must be more than gracious, at least until the Council is over,” he wrote from Prague on 2 April 1537, “because little by little the habit might be induced of bringing them back to the pristine obedience of the Apostolic See” (ibid., vol. IV, p. 139).

48. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 75, 92-93, 259.

49. Ibid., pp. 73, 76.

50. Ibid., p. 80.

51. G. Constant, *La Légation du Cardinal Morone*, cited above, p. XI.

52. See below, section V.1.

53. *Philippi Melanthonis*, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, edited by Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil, 21 vols., A. C. Schwetschke et filium, Halis Saxonum-Brunsvigae 1834-60, vol. III, cols. 379-83; see Richard M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto 1477-1547. Humanist and Reformer*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1959, pp. 117-20.

54. Walter Friedensburg, “Giovanni Morone und der Brief Sadolets an Melanchthon vom 17. Juni 1537,” in “Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,” I (1903), 4, pp. 372-80.

55. NB1, vol. II, p. 253.

56. Ibid., vol. III, p. 108; “His Holiness has as usual remained satisfied,” Recalcati wrote to Morone on 10 October 1537 (ibid., vol. II, p. 216).

57. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 255-56; see A. Aubert, *Il «Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia»*, cited above, pp. 195 ff.

58. PM, vol. I, p. 489 and note 37; see above, section I.3.

59. NB1, vol. II, p. 222; see pp. 233, 244, 247, 255-56, 262, 268, 283, 301, 315-16, 321, 329; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 60 ff.

60. NB1, vol. II, p. 266.

61. See ibid., pp. 293-309.

62. Ibid., p. 320.

63. Franz Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des Cardinals Gasparo Contarini (1483-1542)*, Verlag von Huye's Buchhandlung, Braunsberg 1881, pp. 278-79; on Bechyně, see Peter G. Bietenholz and Thomas B. Deutscher, eds., *Contemporaries of Erasmus. A Biographical Register of Renaissance and Reformation*, 3 vols., University of Toronto Press, Toronto-Buffalo-London 1985, vol. I, p. 114.

64. NB1, vol. II, pp. 271-72; see PM, vol. II, pp. 1250, 1440-41.

65. NB1, vol. II, p. 151.

66. MoAC, Capitolo, 109.

67. Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 38, 57.

68. NB1, vol. II, p. 162.

69. Ibid., p. 361; vol. IV, p. 12.

70. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 110, 205; vol. IV, p. 12; see pp. 20-22.

71. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 131, 135-36.

72. Ibid., pp. 165-66.

73. Ibid., pp. 374, 422.

74. Paul Kalkoff, *Die Depeschen des Nuntius Aleander von Wormser Reichstage 1521*, Max Niemeyer, Halle a.S., 1897.

75. NB1, vol. III, p. 108; see p. 107 and vol. IV, p. 10.

76. Ibid., vol. III, p. 167.

77. Ibid., p. 457.

78. Ibid., p. 195.

79. Ibid., p. 161.

80. Ibid., vol. IV, pp. 10-11.

81. Ibid., vol. III, p. 166.

82. Ibid., p. 165.

83. Ibid., pp. 169-72.

84. PM, vol. I, p. 490.

85. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 182; see NB1, vol. IV, pp. 37, 67-68.

86. NB1, vol. IV, pp. 70-79.

87. Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 104-5, 112, 121, 156. The trial testimonies published in PM, vol. I, pp. 1223-24; vol. II, pp. 1121-23, 1164-66, may refer to these brief stays by Morone in the parish district.

88. See NB1, vol. I, pp. 24-25, his letter of 13 December.

89. Ibid., vol. IV, pp. 80-81.

90. Ibid., p. 89; see the following pages.

91. C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. I, p. 681.

92. NB1, vol. IV, pp. 114-15, dispatch of 2 July.

93. Ibid., pp. 84-85; see pp. 88-89.

94. Ibid., pp. 405-7.

95. Ibid., pp. 112-13, 115, 124.

96. Ibid., p. 115.

97. Ibid., p. 94.

98. Ibid., pp. 128-33.

99. Ibid., pp. 137-38; see also the dispatch of 17 November in NBM, p. 50; PM, vol. II, pp. 250-58.

100. See the memorials he sent to Paul III on 29 June 1539, published by Hugo Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI illustrantia*, Herder, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1861, pp. 233-39.

101. NB1, vol. IV, pp. 141-42.

102. Ibid., pp. 143-52; NBM, pp. 3-7, joint letter of Morone and Aleandro of 5 August.

103. NB1, vol. IV, p. 222, and NBM, p. 33.

104. NBM, p. 38.

105. Ibid., pp. 96, 100-1.

106. PM, vol. II, pp. 254-55.

107. Ibid., pp. 259-65, especially p. 262; NBM, pp. 57-63.

108. NBM, p. 64.

109. Ibid., p. 67.

110. Ibid., p. 80; but see pp. 78-81, Morone's entire lucid memorial.

111. Ibid., pp. 64-65.

112. Ibid., pp. 71-72; see p. 69.

113. Ibid., p. 87.

114. Ibid., p. 95.

115. PM, vol. I, p. 537; see p. 545; vol. II, p. 171.

116. On this point, see Albano Biondi, “La giustificazione della simulazione religiosa nel Cinquecento,” in idem et al., *Eresia e riforma nell'Italia del Cinquecento. Miscellanea I*, Sansoni-The Newberry Library, Florence-Chicago 1974, pp. 7-68, now in idem, *Umanisti, eretici, streghe. Saggi di storia moderna*, edited by Massimo Donattini, introduction by Adriano Prosperi, Comune di Modena, Modena 2008, pp. 15-65, especially pp. 41-43.

117. PM, vol. II, pp. 269-84; NB1, vol. V, pp. 154-59.

118. PM, vol. I, p. 499.

119. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 285-86.

120. NBM, pp. 109, 112, 118, 129, 132; see p. 115.

121. Ibid., pp. 107-8; see NB1, vol. V, pp. 175-82.

122. NBM, p. 125.

123. See NB1, vol. V, pp. 413-18, the instructions for Morone drafted by Aleandro, and Paul III's briefs to Ferdinand of Habsburg, several German princes, and Johann Eck, dated Rome, 14-15 May 1540. On the

religious colloquies, in addition to Jedin, vol. I, pp. 399 ff., it is sufficient to cite Klaus Ganzer and Karl-Heinz zur Mühlen, eds., *Akten der deutschen Reichsreligionsgespräche im 16. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols., Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2000-2007, especially vol. I on the Hagenau colloquies, and Otto Scheib, *Die innerchristlichen Religionsgespräche im Abendland. Regionale Verbreitung, institutionelle Gestalt, theologische Themen, kirchenpolitische Funktion. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des konfessionellen Zeitalters (1517-1689)*, 3 vols., Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2009, vol. I. On Morone's role in particular, see Paolo Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano del Cinquecento. Questione religiosa e nicodemismo politico*, Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Rome 1979, pp. 230 ff.

124. NBM, p. 134.

125. *Monumenti di varia letteratura tratti dai manoscritti di monsignor Ludovico Beccadelli arcivescovo di Ragusa*, edited by Giambattista Morandi, 2 vols., nell'Instituto delle scienze, Bologna 1797-1804, vol. I/2, pp. 84-85.

126. PM, vol. II, p. 298; see H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 273.

127. On him, it is enough to refer to Gigliola Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini. Un magistrato veneziano al servizio della cristianità*, Olschki, Florence 1988, and Elizabeth G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini. Venice, Rome, and Reform*, University of California Press, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford 1993.

128. Pole, *Epistolae*, vol. III, pp. CCLXIV; see also pp. CCLXVI-CCLXVII, the subsequent letter of 26 June.

129. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 275-76.

130. Ibid., p. 287.

131. In November 1546, for example, Giovanni Bianchetti informed Giovanni Della Casa, then nuncio in Venice, that Paul III judged his letters “somewhat dry,” because “the nature of Our Lord is to wish also to hear the opinion of the person writing” (Antonio Menniti Ippolito, Paolo III e monsignor Della Casa. Psicologie di

ecclesiastici in un decennio di transizione, in Amedeo Quondam, ed., Giovanni *Della Casa. Un seminario per il centenario*, Bulzoni, Rome 2006, pp. 131-53, especially p. 137).

132. NB1, vol. V, p. 418; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 129 ff.

133. NBM, pp. 137-38.

134. See below, sections IX.1 and XV.4.

135. PM, vol. II, p. 1197.

136. Ibid., p. 299.

137. NBM, p. 162; he had also written to Cervini the day before: “In truth, I feared that they no longer remembered either me or the German assemblies” (NB1, vol. V, p. 461).

138. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 286.

139. NBM, pp. 208-9, 214.

140. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 334.

141. NBM, p. 164, letter of 10 October 1540.

142. NB1, vol. V, p. 480.

143. On the Colloquy of Worms, see K. Ganzer and K.-H. zur Mühlen, eds., *Akten der deutschen Reichsreligionsgespräche*, cited above, vol. II.

144. NB1, vol. V, p. 462; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 133 ff.

145. NBM, p. 182.

146. Ibid., pp. 186-87.

147. Ibid., p. 224.

148. PM, vol. II, p. 155.

149. NBM, pp. 228-29.

150. NB1, vol. V, p. 488.

151. See PM, vol. II, p. 942.

152. NBM, pp. 232-33. In his testimony in Morone’s defense, Tommaso Campeggi would recall that he “feared the snares of the Lutherans, and especially when coming from Vienna to Worms for the said colloquy he had to make a long detour in order to avoid the dangers and snares of the Lutherans” (PM, vol. II, p. 894).

153. NB1, vol. VI, pp. 50-51.

154. NBM, pp. 232-33.

155. NB1, vol. VI, pp. 3-13; on him and on what follows, see C. Centa, *Una dinastia* episcopale, cited above, vol. I, pp. 230 ff.; and in general Pastor, vol. V, pp. 261 ff.

156. NBM, pp. 233-34.

157. NB1, vol. VI, p. 29.

158. Ibid., p. 51.

159. NBM, p. 234.

160. Ibid., pp. 237-38; see NB1, vol. VI, pp. 111, 121-22, 132.

161. NB1, vol. VI, p. 57; see pp. 66, 69.

162. PM, vol. II, p. 935.

163. See the letter written to him by Cristoforo Madruzzo on 15 January 1548 (CT, vol. XI/2, p. 349).

164. NB1, vol. VI, pp. 60-61.

165. NBM, p. 238, letter of 27 December 1540.

166. NB1, vol. VI, p. 112; see p. 132. The personal and political conflicts between Morone and Campeggi emerge with complete clarity from a letter sent by the Este ambassador in Rome on 1 January 1541 (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma*, 39); see also the letter sent by Campeggi on 15 January 1541 in H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 331-33.

167. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 87.

168. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 322.

169. Ibid., p. 330.

170. NB1, vol. VI, p. 121; more cautious were the words with which Morone alluded to the affair in a contemporary letter to Contarini (*Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 96-97).

171. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 341.

172. Ibid., p. 345.

173. NBMR, pp. 656-57; see pp. 662, 666-67.

174. PM, vol. II, pp. 311-18; H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 324-28.

175. NB1, vol. VI, p. 135; from a dispatch by Campeggi dated 18 January, which says that he departed that morning, it seems possible to infer that Morone did not take leave of him (H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 334, 338).

176. *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 100-5.

177. NBMR, pp. 429-30.

178. On the Colloquy of Regensburg, see K. Ganzer and K.-H. zur Mühlen, eds., *Akten der deutschen Reichsreligionsgespräche*, cited above, vol. II.

179. NBMR, pp. 430-32; see his letter of 27 February (H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 358-59; see p. 361).

180. “Your Lordship’s justifications regarding the matters at Worms and your having negotiated separately, etc., were not very necessary, because although the ministers of His Imperial Majesty lodged a complaint about it, and Our Lord therefore instructed me to warn you, it has nevertheless never entered His Holiness’s mind that Your Lordship did not do everything after careful consideration” (NB1, vol. VII, p. 29; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 147 ff.).

181. Viktor Schultze, *Fünfzehn Depeschen aus Regensburg vom 10 März bis 28. Juni 1541*, in “Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,” III (1879), pp. 609-53, especially pp. 611, 612, letter of 12 May.

182. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 340.

183. NB1, vol. VII, p. 33; see also the letter of Bernardo Santi dated 25 March 1541, in which, besides noting the legate’s great authority, he said that the bishop of Modena spared no effort in anything he thought would benefit the Catholic cause (ibid., p. 40).

184. A copy of the lost original from the Farnese Archive in Naples is in PRO, 31 9/66, ff. 25-26.

185. PM, vol. II, p. 116.

186. NBMR, pp. 435-37.

187. Schultze, *Fünfzehn Depeschen*, cited above, p. 615, letter of 17 March 1541.

188. Nicholas J. Thompson, *A Reformed Papacy. The Treatment of Papal Primacy in the Worms Book (1540)*, in Francesca Aran Murphy and Christopher Asprey, eds., *Ecumenism Today. The Universal Church in the 21st Century*, Ashgate, Aldershot, UK-Charlton, VT, 2008, pp. 151-71, especially p. 156. On

Contarini's and Morone's interventions, see Brian Lugioyo, *Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification. Reformation Theology and Early Modern Irenicism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2010, pp. 161-62.

189. *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 200; see P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 257-58.

190. Heinz Mackensen, "The Diplomatic Role of Gasparo Cardinal Contarini at the Colloquy *of Ratisbon of 1541*," in "Church History," XXVII (1958), pp. 312-37, especially pp. 314-15.

191. P. Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*, cited above, p. 181.

192. H. Mackensen, "The Diplomatic Role of Gasparo Cardinal Contarini," cited above, p. 322.

193. V. Schultze, *Fünfzehn Depeschen*, cited above, pp. 635-36; see p. 633; NB1, vol. VII, pp. 41-42, 44-48. On Contarini's efforts at the Diet of Regensburg, it is sufficient to refer to the studies by H. Mackensen, "The Diplomatic Role of Gasparo Cardinal Contarini," cited above; P. Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg*, cited above; the round table on *I colloqui di Ratisbona: l'azione e le idee di Gasparo Contarini*, in *Gasparo Contarini e il suo tempo*, proceedings of the conference (Venice, 1-3 March 1985), edited by Francesca Cavazzana Romanelli, preface by Giuseppe Alberigo, Comune di Venezia-Studium cattolico veneziano, Venice 1988, pp. 167-242; G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 57 ff.; Albrecht P. Luttenberger, *Kaiser, Kurie und Reichstag. Kardinallegat Contarini in Regensburg* 1541, in Reichstag *und Kirche*, proceedings of the conference (Munich, 9 March 1990), edited by Erich Meuthen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1991, pp. 89-136; E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 186 ff. On the relations between Contarini and Morone, see Klaus Ganzer, *Gasparo Contarini* und Giovanni Morone. Das Regensburger Religionsgespräch von 1541 und das *Werden einer Freundschaft*, in "Cristianesimo nella storia," XXX (2009), pp. 99-134.

194. *Gasparo Contarini*, Gegenreformatorische Schriften (c. 1530-1542), edited by Friedrich Hünermann, Aschendorff, Münster in Westfalen 1923, p. 22.

195. V. Schultze, *Dreizehn Depeschen*, cited above, p. 156.

196. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 279.

197. NBMR, pp. 449-50.

198. See below, section IV.1.

199. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 372.

200. PM, vol. II, pp. 333-37; see NBMR, p. 454.

201. PM, vol. II, pp. 338-44; see below, section III.3.

202. NBMR, pp. 457-59; see E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 217-48. According to E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 110-12, Paul III consciously used the war against Colonna to obstruct the feared religious colloquies in Germany.

203. NBMR, pp. 462-63.

204. Ibid., p. 621.

205. NB1, vol. VII, p. 55.

206. NBMR, pp. 471-72.

207. Ludwig von Pastor, *Die Correspondenz des Cardinals Contarini während seiner deutschen Legation 1541*, in "Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft," I (1880), pp. 321-92, 473-501, especially pp. 474-76.

208. Theodor Brieger, *Zur Correspondenz Contarini's während seiner deutschen Legation. Mitteilungen aus Beccadelli's Monumenti*, in "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte," III (1879), pp. 492-523, especially pp. 509, 512-13.

209. NB1, vol. VII, p. 65, letter to Marcello Cervini of 9 June 1541.

210. Ibid., p. 24; see also the following pages.

211. P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 113 ff.

212. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 379.

213. NB1, vol. VII, p. 26.

214. Ibid., p. 72.

215. NBMR, pp. 622-23.

216. Ibid., p. 625.

217. Ibid., pp. 640-41.

218. NB1, vol. VII, p. 81. On the Regensburg colloquies as a turning point in the definition of Catholic and Protestant positions concerning the concept of *reformatio*, see Cornelis Augustijn, "The Quest of 'Reformatio.' The Diet of Regensburg 1541 as a 'Turning-Point,'" in "Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte," special issue Die *Reformation in Deutschland und Europa. Interpretationen und Debatten*, edited by Hans R. Guggisberg and Gottfried G. Krodel, Gütersloher Verlagshaus, Gütersloh 1993, pp. 64-80.

219. PM, vol. II, pp. 1026-27.

220. NB2, vol. III, p. 283.

221. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 85, 88, 90, 94; NBMR, pp. 640-41.

222. NBMR, p. 647.

223. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 119; see PM, vol. I, p. 492, for what he would write on the subject in 1557, immediately after his arrest.

224. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 95-96.

225. PM, vol. I, p. 493; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 196 ff.

226. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 144-45, 160.

227. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 391.

228. NB1, vol. VII, p. 101.

229. See his letter to Marcello Cervini, dated Milan, 19 October 1541 (ibid., p. 102 and note 3).

230. Ibid., p. 99.

231. CT, vol. IV, p. 209.

232. NB1, vol. VII, p. 103.

233. Lancillotti, vol. VI, p. 146; see the letter from the nuncio in France, Filiberto Ferrero, to Cardinal Farnese dated 18 March 1539 (NG, vol. I, p. 450).

234. Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 162, 164.

235. MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. II, f. 5r (original); see G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 306-7; NB1, vol. VII, p. 103, note.

236. PM, vol. II, p. 951.

237. Patrizio Foresta, *Ad Dei gloriam et Germaniae utilitatem. San Pietro Canisio e gli inizi* della Compagnia di Gesù nei territori dell'Impero tedesco (1543-1555), Rubbettino, Soveria Mannelli 2006, index; see idem, "Wie ein Apostel Deutschlands." Apostolat, *Obrigkeit und jesuitisches Selbstverständnis am Beispiel des Petrus Canisius (1543*-1570), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 2015; John W. O'Malley, *I primi gesuiti* [1993], Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1999, pp. 273 ff.

238. See below, section XIII.4.

239. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 141-42.

240. Claudio Ferlan, *I gesuiti tra Santa Sede e Casa d'Austria ai tempi della soppressione*, in Michela Catto and Claudio Ferlan, eds., *I gesuiti e i papi*, il Mulino, Bologna 2016, pp. 77-101, especially p. 78. On the insistent imperial attempts to support Canisius's candidacy through Morone, see P. Foresta, "Wie ein Apostel Deutschlands," cited above, p. 322.

241. See the entry by John Patrick Donnelly, "*Fabro (Faber, Favre, Le Fèvre),*" in Diccionario *histórico de la Compañía de Jesús. Biográfico-temático*, edited by Charles E. O'Neill and Joaquín M. Domínguez, 4 vols., Institutum Historicum-Universidad Pontificia Comillas, Rome-Madrid 2001, vol. II, pp. 1369-70; and Favre's letter to Loyola from Worms, 27 December 1540 (Petri Fabri, *Epistolae, memoriale et processus*, typis Gabrielis Lopez del Horno, Matriti 1914, pp. 45-46). On Favre's closeness to the *spirituali*, see P. Foresta, "Wie ein Apostel Deutschlands," cited above, pp. 167-69.

242. P. Fabri, *Epistolae, memoriale et processus*, cited above, pp. 140, 442.

243. Ibid., pp. 444-45.

244. Patrizio Foresta, Die "Missio in Germaniam." Die Wahrnehmung des Apostolats durch den jungen Canisius, in Johannes Meier, ed., *Sendung-Eroberung-Begegnung. Franz Xaver, die Gesellschaft Jesu und die katholische Weltkirche im Zeitalter des* Barock, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden 2005, pp. 31-66, especially pp. 38-39; idem, *Per una storia* economica della Compagnia di Gesù nell'impero tedesco in età moderna: ipotesi di ricerca, in *Clero, economia e contabilità in Europa. Tra Medioevo ed età contemporanea*, proceedings of the conference (Siena, 14-16 September 2006), edited by Roberto Di Pietra and Fiorenzo Landi, Carocci, Rome 2007, pp. 283-96, especially pp. 287-88; P. Foresta, "Wie ein Apostel Deutschlands," cited above, pp. 167-69, 181-82.

245. P. Foresta, *Ad Dei gloriam*, cited above, pp. 13-14.

246. Ulderico Parente, *Note sull'attività missionaria di Nicolás Bobadilla nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia prima del concilio di Trento (1540-1541)*, in "Rivista storica italiana," CXVII (2005), pp. 64-79.

247. Mario Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez 1556-1565*, vols. III and IV of *Storia della Compagnia di* Gesù in Italia, La civiltà cattolica, Rome 1964-74, vol. III, p. 227.

248. William V. Bangert, To the Other Towns. A Life of Blessed Peter Favre, First *Companion of St. Ignatius*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco 2002; idem, *Claude Jay and Alfonso Salmerón: Two Early Jesuits*, Loyola University Press, Chicago 1985, pp. 246, 285.

249. P. Foresta, "Wie ein Apostel Deutschlands," cited above, pp. 186-87.

250. M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 226-27.

251. Pierroberto Scaramella, *I primi gesuiti e l'Inquisizione romana (1547-1562)*, in "Rivista storica italiana," CXVII (2005), pp. 135-57, especially pp. 154-55.

252. Patrizio Foresta, *I primi gesuiti e la corte. Alcune considerazioni a proposito di un luogo comune storiografico*, in "Schifanoia," nos. 26-27 (2004), pp. 169-77, especially p. 174; idem, "Un catechismo per li todeschi." Per un'archeologia della "Summae doctrinae christianae," in Paul Oberholzer, ed., Diego Laínez (1512-1565) and His *Generalate. Jesuit with Jewish Roots, Close Confidant of Ignatius of Loyola, Preeminent Theologian of the Council of Trent*, Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, Rome 2015, pp. 690-716.

253. J. W. O'Malley, *I primi gesuiti*, cited above, p. 191.

254. Sabina Pavone, *Preti riformati e riforma della Chiesa. I gesuiti al concilio di Trento*, in "Rivista storica italiana," CXVII (2005), pp. 110-34, especially pp. 110-11.

255. Giorgio Caravale, *Ambrogio Catarino Politi e i primi gesuiti*, ibid., pp. 79-109, especially pp. 94-95.

256. On the papal appointment of the two Jesuit theologians, see Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae et* instructiones, 12 vols., Gabrielis Lopez del Horno, Madrid 1903-11, vol. X, pp. 100-1; and, among others, Paul Dudon, *St. Ignatius of Loyola*, Bruce, Milwaukee, WI, 1949, p. 315; M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 161.

257. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. VIII, p. 402, letter of 12 and 13 February 1555; for other letters on the dispatch of Morone and the Jesuits to Augsburg, see ibid., pp. 266, 270, 275, 277, 278, 287, 310, 316, 320, 334.

258. Fredrik Heiding, *Ignatian Spirituality at Ecclesial Frontiers*, University of Oxford, Faculty of Theology, DPhil dissertation, 2012, p. 52.

259. Michela Catto, *La Compagnia divisa. Il dissenso nell'ordine gesuitico tra '500 e '600*, Morcelliana, Brescia 2009, pp. 55-56 and note 156.

260. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. IX, p. 114, letter of 8 June 1555.

261. See ibid., p. 118, Loyola's letter to Francisco Borja of 14 November 1555, in which he reported that some friars "preach against the Society from the pulpits" and that the cardinal of Carpi had suggested asking Morone to intervene as protector of the Friars Preachers. In that same capacity Morone would intervene in 1556 to facilitate the transfer to the Jesuits of the former Dominican convent of San Clemente in Prague (Petri Canisii, *Epistulae et acta*, edited by Otto Braunsberger, 8 vols., Herder, Friburgi Brisgoviae 1896-1923, vol. II, p. 18; see also Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. XII, pp. 94-95, 171).

262. Joannis Alphonsi de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Iesu historia*, 6 vols., Typographorum Societas-Augustinus Avrial, Matriti 1894-98, vol. V, p. 264. The subject had already been raised the previous year in a conversation between Morone and Julius III, about which Loyola wrote to Canisius on 28 November 1554 (Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. VIII, p. 113).

III. "With Dexterity and Gentleness": Heresy in Modena

1. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 267, note 69; see the anonymous note of 26 April preserved in MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. I, f. 3rv.

2. MiAS, Autografi, 45, fasc. *Giovanni Moroni*, letter to Francesco II Sforza of 23 March 1532; see there the letters of 3, 4, 7, and 25 February and 8 March 1531, and 14, 16, 20, and 23 March, 4 and 12 April, 7 June, 7 July, 6 and 9 August 1532, and 9 March and 3 November 1533.

3. Modena, ASC, *Camera segreta. Lettere antiche di personaggi illustri. Morone Giovanni*.

4. PM, vol. II, p. 1278; see A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 17-18.

5. He would return to the subject again on the 24th (MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. I, ff. 4r-7v).

6. Lancillotti, vol. IV, pp. 187-88, 242-44. "His Lordship will be a good shepherd," he noted on 10 April (ibid., p. 256).

7. Ibid., p. 226.

8. See Michelle M. Fontaine, "For the Good of the City: The Bishop and the Ruling Elite in *Tridentine Modena*," in "The Sixteenth Century Journal," XXVIII (1997), pp. 29-43, which, however, deals only with the episcopate of Egidio Foscarari (1550-64).

9. MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. IV, ff. 3r-4v, 13r, 17r, 19r, 23r, letters of 18 December 1560, 11 January and 26 February 1561, 21 November and 26 December 1562, and 25 August 1563; the draft of a ducal reply is there, fasc. VI, f. 7r; see Giuseppe Pistoni, *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'abbazia di* Frassinoro, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," series X, VIII (1973), pp. 155-57; idem, *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone, cittadino di Modena*, cited above. The indult that had permitted him to resign the diocese allowed him to recover the bishopric should it become vacant, and enabled him to confer vacant benefices.

10. MiAS, Autografi, 45, fasc. *Giovanni Moroni*; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 72.

11. Attached to the letter is the draft of the duke's reply, dated 29 October, confirming his intention to intervene with Este "so that you may have that strong arm" (MiAS, Famiglie, 126, fasc. *Famiglia e congiunti del fu gran cancellier Gerolamo Morone*; see also there the letter of 4 December, with the draft of the ducal reply of the 8th attached).

12. Ibid.; see also the letters of 29 March and 1 November 1534.

13. Lancillotti, vol. IV, p. 248.

14. MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. I, ff. 10r-11v.

15. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 98-100.

16. Lancillotti, vol. IV, pp. 266, 293, 318. The bishop left again for Milan on 21 January 1534, and on 9 January of the following year had to go "by post to Rome, summoned by His Holiness the pope, it is said to make him governor of Imola" (ibid., p. 442); see PM, vol. II, p. 1279.

17. Matteo Duni, *Tra religione e magia. Storia del prete modenese Guglielmo Campana* (1460?-1541), Olschki, Florence 1999.

18. Lancillotti, vol. IV, p. 244.

19. MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. I, ff. 12r-18v, Morone's letters to the Este duke of 26 July, 4 August, and 17 September 1536, the last accompanied by another addressed to the ducal secretary Bartolomeo Prospero; see Andrea Gianelli, *Lettere del cardinal Giovanni Morone conservate all'Archivio di Stato di Modena*, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," series X, III (1968), pp. 57-61, especially p. 58; see PM, vol. II, pp. 847-49 and notes 32-35.

20. Lancillotti, vol. IV, pp. 249-50.

21. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 202-5; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 101, likewise believes that "Morone's pastoral visitation of 1533 was unquestionably carried out under the inspiration of Giberti's visitations."

22. On this text, see G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 79-211; see M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 216 ff. The surviving sixteenth-century pastoral visitations in Modena are listed by Giuseppe Pistoni, *Le visite pastorali a Modena nel secolo decimosesto*, in "Memorie dell'Accademia nazionale di scienze, lettere e arti *di Modena*," series VI, XV (1973), pp. 111-14; see also Maria Teresa Rebucci, *Le visite pastorali dei vescovi di Modena: Giovanni Morone e Sisto Visdomini*, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," series X, III (1968), pp. 103-16.

23. E. Cattaneo, *Istituzioni ecclesiastiche milanesi*, cited above, pp. 523, 531; Giorgio Chittolini, *Alcune note sui documenti delle visite pastorali degli arcivescovi Nardini e Arcimboldi*, in "Studia borromaica," IX (1995), pp. 37-44.

24. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 101 ff., 122 ff.

25. PM, vol. I, p. 466; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 162 ff.

26. PM, vol. I, p. 893.

27. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 114 ff. On the sparse pastoral visitations in Modena between 1552 and 1588, see Matteo Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie. Attuazione e divulgazione del concilio di Trento a Modena (1563-1627)*, Poligrafico Mucchi, Modena 2005, pp. 169 ff.

28. PM, vol. I, pp. 891-92, 899, 919-21.

29. Ibid., pp. 935-36; see also p. 948.

30. Ibid., pp. 954-56.

31. Ibid., pp. 961-62, 966-67.

32. Ibid., p. 963.

33. Ibid., p. 968.

34. Ibid., pp. 987-88; see also the following pages.

35. Ibid., pp. 989-91.

36. Ibid., pp. 995-98.

37. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 333.

38. Ibid., vol. X, pp. 60, 126; vol. XI, p. 226; see PM, vol. I, p. 873, note 74.

39. PM, vol. I, pp. 939-40; see pp. 873-75, 892, 947-49, 956, 957, 965, 985; vol. II, pp. 331, 339, 473.

40. See below, section IV.1.

41. See below, section III.4.

42. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 369-73.

43. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 117, 119.

44. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 255 ff.

45. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 120-22.

46. PM, vol. I, p. 435.

47. PM, vol. I, pp. 487-88.

48. See the deeds drawn up during Morone's nunciatures in Germany by the notary Bartolomeo della Mirandola in MoAS, *Notarile di Modena*, 1558. Bussani should not be confused with the Modenese Ludovico Bassani, a priest investigated by the Inquisition in 1549.

49. Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 95-96.

50. Craig A. Monson, "*The Council of Trent Revisited*," in "Journal of the American Musicological Society," LV (2002), pp. 1-37, especially pp. 5, 13.

51. PM, vol. I, p. 480 and note 32.

52. This is attested by the affection shown Giovanni Morone by Hermann Matthias Werrecore, probably a Fleming, chapel master of Milan Cathedral between 1522 and 1550, a protégé of Francesco II Sforza and composer of sacred music for Ferrante Gonzaga, Alfonso d'Avalos, and Maria d'Aragona. Werrecore's many connections with heterodox aristocrats, clerics, and men of letters are attested by a manuscript preserved in the Biblioteca civica of Bergamo and dedicated to *Vittore Soranzo*. It contains paraphrases of Psalms by the Milanese man of letters Publio *Francesco Spinola*, condemned for heresy and executed in Venice in 1567 (Pio Paschini, *Un umanista disgraziato nel Cinquecento. Publio Francesco Spinola*, in "Nuovo archivio veneto," XXXVII [1919], pp. 65-186), as well as verses dedicated to illustrious figures, among them the Milanese cardinal himself (Christine Getz, "*Hermann Matthias Werrecore and the North Italian Circle of Liberal Humanists in Counter-Reformation Italy*," in "Arte lombarda," CXVIII [1996], pp. 15-25; idem, "*Music in* the 16th and 17th Centuries," in A. Gamberini, ed., *A Companion to Late Medieval and Early Modern Milan*, cited above, pp. 306-29).

53. Costanzo Cargnoni, ed., *I frati cappuccini. Documenti e testimonianze del primo* secolo, 5 vols., Efi, Perugia 1988-93, vol. III/2, p. 3181; see G. Pistoni, *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone, cittadino di Modena*, cited above, p. 39.

54. PM, vol. II, pp. 266-68; NBM, pp. 102-3. It is worth emphasizing that this letter, together with others on the same problem that will be cited below, was later included by Morone among the documents for his defense, in order to refute the charges that he had favored the Modenese heterodox. "I know that while I was in Germany I was informed several times that there were heresies in Modena, and for this reason I tried to persuade the pope either to let me return to my residence or to make provision himself," he would state in November 1557 (PM, vol. I, pp. 639-40).

55. PM, vol. II, p. 331.

56. NBM, p. 118; see pp. 128-29.

57. Ibid., p. 138; PM, vol. II, p. 309.

58. NBM, pp. 179, 181, 192, 209, letters of 27 July, 1 August, 3 September, 6 October, and 27 December 1540.

59. NBMR, p. 432; see the letter of 12 March published by V. Schultze, *Fünfzehn Depeschen*, cited above, p. 611.

60. Idem, *Dreizehn Depeschen*, cited above, p. 155.

61. NBM, pp. 65-66.

62. NB1, vol. II, p. 301; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana e Controriforma. Studi sul cardinal Giovanni Morone e il suo processo d'eresia*, il Mulino, Bologna 1992, pp. 59 ff.

63. NB1, vol. II, p. 314; see also p. 334.

64. Ibid., vol. V, pp. 220-21.

65. PM, vol. II, pp. 287-89; NBM, p. 129; see NB1, vol. V, pp. 232-33.

66. PM, vol. II, pp. 290-93.

67. NBM, p. 225.

68. See, for example, Lancillotti, vol. VI, pp. 204, 206, 236-37, or the letter sent from Regensburg to the Conservators of Modena on 7 February 1541, in which Morone ordered alms for the benefit of the College of Orphan Girls (Modena, ASC, *Ex Actis*, 1530-1544). The limited effectiveness of the measure is attested by the *Grida sopra le maschere* published in Ferrara on 1 January 1545 (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Gride a stampa*, 1). In 1560 Tommaso Campeggi would say that he had then advised Morone not to be "so rigorous and scrupulous with his people of Modena, because His Lordship had forbidden masks to be made as instruments and occasions of sin, although they brought good earnings to many artisans of that city, since they were distributed throughout Italy" (PM, vol. II, p. 892).

69. "I repeatedly admonished a gentlewoman named Lady Lucrezia Rangoni, in whose house he [Girolamo Teggia] was staying. And although I could never catch him, nevertheless, because of the suspicion I had of him, I repeatedly tried in various ways to persuade the aforesaid lady to drive him away," Morone would later say (PM, vol. I, pp. 636-37; see also pp. 638-39, 1215, 1224-25; and the documents published ibid., vol. II, pp. 453-57).

70. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 849-60.

71. Ibid., vol. II, p. 304.

72. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 875-76.

73. Ibid., p. 871.

74. Ibid., p. 820.

75. The bishop of Modena sent the vicar copies of both letters, although only the one to Farnese survives, on 29 December 1540, together with a passage from Cervini's otherwise lost reply, which assured him that he was always available for "anything I might be able to do for the good government of that church" (ibid., vol. II, pp. 306-8).

76. Ibid., pp. 308-10; the text of the brief is ibid., pp. 320-21; see NB1, vol. VI, pp. 91-92. As early as 28 January the cardinal-nephew had informed Morone of it, assuring him that "none of the other measures that may be required to avert the dangers Your Lordship describes will be omitted." On 28 February, from Regensburg, Morone urged the vicar to apply to Farnese "wherever necessary for the service of God and the benefit of that people, taking care, however, not to weary him except in essential and weighty matters, so that weak ones may not harm substantial ones" (PM, vol. II, p. 329).

77. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 319-20.

78. On this member of Morone's household, see the introduction to the critical edition of his inquisitorial trial, ibid., vol. I, pp. 1157 ff.

79. Ibid., pp. 877-81; see also pp. 641-47, 1215 ff. The letters Sigibaldi sent to Germany on 24 December 1540 and 11 and 13 January 1541 must be regarded as lost. Morone recalled them in his reply from Regensburg on 7 February, in which he advised him to continue keeping Cervini informed "of that poison which is spreading through Modena, certifying only what you know for certain, but without regard for human considerations, because the danger is too grave," and to warn Lucrezia Rangoni about Teggia (ibid., vol. II, pp. 322-23).

80. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 893-94.

81. Ibid., pp. 884-87.

82. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 212 ff.

83. PM, vol. II, pp. 326-27.

84. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 894-923. "This morning, Carnival Monday, Friar Bernardino of Siena of the Capuchin order preached in the cathedral, and there were so many people that there was scarcely room to stand, and the whole Academy was there, which wanted him to remain and preach in Modena this Lent," Lancillotti noted on that same 28 February, vol. VII, p. 19. On the echoes of Ochino's preaching in Modena, see the letter sent by Giovanni Grillenzoni to Cardinal Sadoleto on 3 July 1542 (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 394).

85. PM, vol. I, pp. 924-27.

86. Ibid., pp. 928-37.

87. Ibid., pp. 943-47.

88. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 330-31.

89. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 958-59.

90. Ibid., pp. 964-68.

91. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 338-44.

92. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 905-7 and note 210, Sigibaldi's letter of 1 March and Bertari's reply.

93. Ibid., pp. 978-82. Shortly afterward, on 8 June, Sigibaldi provided further details about Bertari and about the disclosures by certain suspects concerning the "many heretics of this city," among them the bookseller Antonio Gadaldino (ibid., pp. 988-85).

94. See above, section II.6.

95. NB1, vol. VII, p. 101.

96. ASV, *Arm. XLI*, 22, f. 337rv; edited by Pietro Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di* Gesù in Italia, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Civiltà cattolica, Rome 1950-51, vol. I/2, p. 131; see Gigliola Fragnito, *Il cardinale Gregorio Cortese nella crisi religiosa del Cinquecento*, Abbazia di S. Paolo (offprint from "Benedictina"), Rome 1983, p. 84.

97. See the letter sent to the duke by the governor of Modena, Francesco Villa, on 7 June 1542 (MoBE, ms. Ital., 854, f. 191rv; edited by G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese*, cited above, vol. II, p. 185). It is known that between March and April another illustrious prelate from that city, Cardinal Iacopo Sadoleto, also stayed in Modena (Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 227-32; a letter of his dated Modena, 10 April 1542, is in FiAS, *Carte del cardinal di Ravenna*, 12, f. 93r; see Ludovico Beccadelli's letter to Carlo Gualteruzzi of 6 April in MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*; see Saverio Ritter, *Un umanista teologo. Jacopo Sadoleto 1477-1547*, Libreria Editrice Religiosa Francesco Ferrari, Rome 1912, pp. 21-22). It is difficult, however, to imagine that at that point he, lacking any official appointment, could have intervened in any way in those delicate problems, although they must have been well known to him.

98. See below, sections IV.2 and V.1.

99. PM, vol. I, pp. 465-66.

100. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 433, 464-67. Even in 1545-46, when a Dominican reproached him for the "great multitude of heretics" in Modena, Morone would reply: "With this modesty of yours you will help them; they must be helped with charity" (ibid., p. 717).

101. Francesco Negri Bassanese, *Tragedia intitolata Libero arbitrio*, second enlarged edition, MDL [n.p., n.d., but 1551], p. [B6]r, where the author rejoiced at the spread of evangelical truth south of the Alps, but added: "It grieves me greatly, and I cannot say this without tears, that two most noble cities, Modena and Vicenza, have grown so cold from their first warmth, which at one time was such that it warmed all Italy."

102. PM, vol. I, pp. 307-8.

103. Ibid., pp. 999-1013; see pp. 602-3.

104. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 347.

105. PM, vol. I, pp. 435-36; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 270.

106. PM, vol. I, pp. 267-68, 704-5, 709-10.

107. Ibid., p. 149; see p. 597.

108. See his reply of 18 November to the letter Alessandro Farnese had sent him on the 8th: "And because, as you truthfully say, I am accustomed to obey, I shall come, although the nature of the season and my other needs would require me to remain in this city for several months" (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 231).

109. PM, vol. I, p. 182.

110. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 435, 437, and Alessandro Farnese's letter of 10 December 1541 to the nuncio in Venice, Giorgio Andreasi, announcing, among other things, Morone's departure "for his journey to Germany" (NV, vol. II, p. 321). On 10 January 1542, however, Farnese wrote to Girolamo Verallo, nuncio to Ferdinand of Habsburg, that "Monsignor of Modena has suffered somewhat from an indisposition of catarrh and then from gout in his own church, so I do not believe he has yet departed, but he cannot delay much longer" (NB1, vol. VII, p. 195).

111. MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Rettori dello Stato. Modena*, 57.

112. Pastor, vol. V, p. 439; also for what follows, see ibid., pp. 438 ff. The formal text of the *Instructio*, edited in CT, vol. IV, pp. 214-15, is dated 8 January 1542.

113. NB1, vol. VII, p. 104; see various preparatory documents for the Diet of Speyer in H. Laemmer, *Meletematum romanorum mantissa*, cited above, pp. 149 ff.

114. NB1, vol. VII, p. 190; Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 181.

115. NB1, vol. VII, p. 105.

116. See the letter he sent that day to Marcello Cervini (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 588).

117. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 106-7.

118. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 398-99: "Since these sects are increasing so greatly, few people enter the ecclesiastical state, and fewer will do so every day; from this arises the neglect of religion, because there is no one to care for it"; see NB1, vol. VII, p. 109.

119. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 399-404.

120. Ibid., p. 406.

121. See ibid., pp. 406-12, the long dispatch of 10 February.

122. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 111-12.

123. Ibid., p. 115.

124. Ibid., pp. 117, 119, 201.

125. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 412.

126. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 119-23.

127. Ibid., pp. 125-26; see H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, pp. 418-19, Morone's letter to the archbishop of Cologne of 28 February 1542.

128. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 148 ff.

129. MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 524, f. 1r.

130. Ibid., f. 2rv; see also ff. 3r-4r, letters of 29 March and 4 April, and the analogous information sent on 9 April to the duke of Ferrara (MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. II, ff. 9r-10v).

131. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 423.

132. See ibid., pp. 424-28; NB1, vol. VII, pp. 135-37; Pastor, vol. V, pp. 442-44; Jedin, vol. I, pp. 506-9.

133. CT, vol. IV, pp. 217-18; see also the following pages.

134. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 138-40.

135. Alfredo Casadei, *Lettere del cardinale Gasparo Contarini durante la sua legazione di Bologna (1542)*, in "Archivio storico italiano," CXVIII (1960), pp. 77-130, 220-85, especially pp. 120-21.

136. NB1, vol. VII, p. 145.

137. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 249.

138. Ibid., p. 257.

139. Ibid., p. 265.

140. A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, pp. 92, 103, 113.

141. "Germany is more inclined toward Lutheranism than it has ever been, and it seems that God gives it aid from every side. No reform can be hoped for from the prelates, because they do not have the spirit of Christ and have grown too old in their vices; and if anyone bestirs himself even slightly, he is immediately extinguished by the multitude of the wicked and is ashamed to live as a Christian, being almost shunned as an innovator and as a person who seeks to disrupt their evil way of life," he wrote to him from Modena on 21 May 1542 (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. CCLXVIII; NB1, vol. VII, pp. 535-36).

142. NB1, vol. VII, pp. 483-85.

143. See above, section III.1.

144. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 361-64 and passim; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 147 ff., and especially Cesare Santus, *La nascita della Santa unione e l'assistenza cittadina (1541-1542)*, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," XXXIII (2011), pp. 85-102.

145. Lancillotti, vol. V, pp. 382, 389-90, 393-96, 406-7, 414; vol. VI, pp. 178-79, 204-5, 271-79; PM, vol. II, pp. 1337-38; on him, see ibid., vol. I, p. 871, note 67; vol. II, pp. 828, 846, 1347-51.

146. Lancillotti, vol. V, p. 428; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 209-11, 241; idem, Dai Paesi Bassi all'Italia. "Il Sommario della sacra Scrittura." Un libro *proibito nella società italiana del Cinquecento*, Olschki, Florence 1997, pp. 217, 220; Filippo Valentini, *Il principe fanciullo. Trattato inedito dedicato a Renata ed Ercole II* d'Este, edited by Lucia Felici, Olschki, Florence 2000, index; Ludovico Castelvetro, *Filologia ed eresia. Scritti religiosi*, edited by Guido Mongini, Morcelliana, Brescia 2010, p. 290 and note 83.

147. PM, vol. I, p. 937; see above, section III.2.

148. See above, section III.3.

149. PM, vol. I, pp. 911-17.

150. Ibid., p. 935; see also p. 938; Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 25, 27, 42-43, 45.

151. See above, section III.2.

152. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 215 ff.

153. See below, section IV.3.

154. See above, sections II.6, III.1, and III.5.

155. See above, section III.1.

156. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, p. 201.

157. See the important study by Guillaume Alonge, *Ludovico da Canossa, l'evangelismo francese e la riforma gibertina*, in "Rivista storica italiana," CXXVI (2014), pp. 5-54.

158. See, for example, the letters Morone sent to Ercole II d'Este, and sometimes to his government officials, in 1542-49, often concerning banditry, waterways and embankments, borders, the property of the episcopal table, and the assignment of benefices (MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. II, ff. 11r-79v; there, fasc. III, ff. 1r-44v; see also there, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Ecclesiastici, capitolo, canonici, vicari, mensa comune*, 265, the contemporary correspondence between the vicar and the duke).

159. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*; see also there the letter of 20 May 1542: "If you are making cardinals, take care not to leave out the bishop of Modena, otherwise I shall never make peace with you."

160. PM, vol. II, pp. 359-75.

161. On this subject it is enough to refer to Anne Jacobson Schutte, *Pier Paolo Vergerio. The Making of an Italian Reformer*, Droz, Geneva 1977 [Italian trans., *Pier Paolo Vergerio e la riforma a Venezia, 1498-1548*, Il Veltro, Rome 1988]; *Pier Paolo Vergerio il Giovane, un polemista attraverso l'Europa del Cinquecento*, proceedings of the conference (Cividale del Friuli, 15-16 October 1998), edited by Ugo Rozzo, Forum, Udine 2000; Robert A. Pierce, *Pier Paolo Vergerio the Propagandist*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2003; Pietro Mozzato, *Jacopo Nacchianti. Un vescovo riformatore (Chioggia 1544-1569)*, Nuova scintilla, Chioggia 1993; Gianmario Italiano, *La pastorale eterodossa di Iacopo Nacchianti a Chioggia (1544-48)*, in "Rivista storica italiana," CXXIII (2011), pp. 741-91; M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above.

162. PM, vol. I, pp. 427-28; at the beginning of the 1570s the Holy Office likewise shared the opinion that "at that time the affairs of the Inquisition proceeded very coldly and little diligence was used in them" (ibid., vol. III, p. 728).

163. Sergio Pagano, *Il processo di Endimio Calandra e l'Inquisizione a Mantova nel 1567*-68, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1991, p. 250; see pp. 50-51.

164. Ibid., pp. 331, 333; see Adriano Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza. Inquisitori, confessori, missionari*, Einaudi, Turin 1996, p. 57.

165. "I could never hope to have the secular arm favorable to me," he would write in 1557 (PM, vol. I, p. 464).

166. See Ercole II d'Este's letter of 27 June 1542 to his ambassador in Rome, Bonifacio Ruggeri, in which he complained of Morone's protests, asserting that he had "never failed to provide him with the secular arm and favor whenever he or his ministers have asked us for it. And therefore it grieves us greatly that wicked and malicious men seek to give His Holiness a bad opinion of us" (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma*, 44).

167. PM, vol. I, pp. 934, 1228.

168. Massimo Firpo, *Riforma religiosa e lingua volgare nell'Italia del '500*, in idem, "Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede," cited above, pp. 121-40, especially pp. 126-30.

169. On Castelvetro's religious positions, see Salvatore Caponetto, *Due opere di* Melantone tradotte da Lodovico Castelvetro: "I principii de la theologia di Ippophilo da Terra Negra" e "Dell'autorità della Chiesa e degli scritti degli antichi," in "Nuova rivista storica," LXX (1986), pp. 253-74; Guido Mongini, Il "Racconto delle vite d'alcuni letterati del suo tempo" di Ludovico Castelvetro: problemi storici e ipotesi di lettura, in *Ludovico Castelvetro. Letterati e grammatici nella crisi religiosa del* Cinquecento, proceedings of the conference (Turin, 21-22 September 2006), edited by Massimo Firpo and Guido Mongini, Olschki, Florence 2008, pp. 285-314; and especially L. Castelvetro, *Filologia ed eresia*, cited above; Lucia Felici, *Frammenti di un dialogo. Ludovico Castelvetro e i suoi rapporti con gli Accademici modenesi*, ibid., pp. 315-55; and especially L. Castelvetro, *Filologia ed eresia*, cited above. On Valentini, see PM, vol. I, p. 124, note 16, and the introduction to F. Valentini, *Il principe fanciullo*, cited above.

170. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 320. On him, see Eleonora Belligni, *Francesco Porto da Ferrara a Ginevra*, in *Ludovico Castelvetro. Letterati e grammatici*, cited above, pp. 357-89.

171. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, pp. 15-16.

172. On the Academy, see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 230 ff.; Matteo Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli. Una comunità eterodossa nella Modena del Cinquecento*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2011, pp. 3 ff.

173. PM, vol. II, pp. 359-62. The tone of this letter and the implicit justifications it contains must clearly be evaluated in light of the new situation created immediately after the establishment of the Roman Holy Office (see below, section III.5).

174. PM, vol. II, p. 362. No copy is known either of the Veronese edition of the *Interrogatorio*, a work by Castellino da Castello (A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, p. 273, note 259), or of the Modenese edition, although the latter was recorded under the date 1 July 1542 by Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 280-81.

175. PM, vol. II, p. 826.

IV. The 1542 Formula of Faith and the Establishment of the Roman Holy Office

1. The letter is lost, but its contents can be inferred from Alessandro Farnese's reply of 1 July (ASV, *Segreteria di Stato. Principi*, 146C, f. 356r).

2. The original of the brief, with Morone's autograph note "contra haereticos mutinenses," is there, *Conc. trid.*, 94, f. 235rv; see F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 235 (no. 904); edited from the draft (ASV, *Arm. XLI*, 24, f. 347r) by B. Fontana, Documenti *vaticani contro l'eresia*, cited above, pp. 388-89, together with the other brief, also dated 23 June, sent to the duke of Ferrara to inform him of the powers granted to Morone and to urge him to provide the bishop with the secular arm. On the use of the briefs, intended to "uncover the evil seed brooding in Modena," see below, section IV.4, and what Morone wrote on 25 July to Cervini, who had announced their dispatch to him on 7 July (PM, vol. II, pp. 351-52).

3. "Here," Morone began, "I have found things that infinitely afflict me and give me no rest, for I recognize the dangers and am uncertain and do not know how to extricate myself so as to save this flock, which I would wish to be able to consign to Christ with my own blood, even at the cost of disgrace in this world, because I burn with shame on hearing, wherever I have been and from every quarter, that this city is Lutheran" (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. CCLXVII-CCLXXI; also edited in P. Fabri, *Epistolae, memoriale et processus*, cited above, pp. 445-47; see also the contemporary letter to Beccadelli in PrBP, ms. Palatino, 1020/1).

4. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*, letter to Carlo Gualteruzzi of 30 March 1542; see A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 251, Contarini's letter to Alessandro Farnese of 28 June.

5. A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, pp. 92-93. It is possible that a passage from Contarini's lost letter to Morone should be attributed to conversations with Valentini; Morone replied on 21 May, observing that "Your Most Reverend Lordship's suspicion is partly true, because it cannot be denied that great ignorance reigns among the friars, joined with great audacity and little charity" (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. CCLXIX). On the newly created Modenese cardinal, formerly master of the Sacred Palace, see Giuseppe Alberigo, "*Badia, Tommaso*," in DBI, vol. V, pp. 74-76.

6. A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 224.

7. PM, vol. I, p. 906.

8. F. Negri, Tragedia, cited above, p. [P8]v.

9. Vergerio's letter to Christoph of Württemberg of 19 February 1558, edited in *Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph, Herzog von Württemberg und Petrus Paulus Vergerius*, edited by Eduard von Kausler and Theodor Schott, H. Laupp, Tübingen 1875, p. 100; see P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 136 ff.

10. PM, vol. II, pp. 363-64.

11. Of Fregoso, under whose name Italian translations of Luther would circulate in subsequent years (Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Le traduzioni italiane di Lutero nella prima metà del* Cinquecento, in "Rinascimento," XVII [1977], pp. 31-108, especially pp. 64 ff.), there are known the *Pio et christianissimo trattato della oratione*, published posthumously in Venice in 1542, 1543, and 1546 and rich in evident heterodox suggestions, and the two short treatises *De la gratia et libero arbitrio* and *Della fede et delle opere*, discovered by Valerio Marchetti, who has for many years announced their publication (PM, vol. I, p. 162, note 82). In none of these texts, however, given their subjects, does it seem possible to identify the one that the Modenese suspects said they were willing to sign in 1542. But in a deposition at his trial Morone would state that he had "seen many works by Fregoso," among them an otherwise unknown *Tractato della vita christiana* extending to forty quarto leaves, all of which were seized from his private study at the time of his arrest (ibid., pp. 522-23, 526-27): this may be identified as the text presented to him fifteen years earlier by the Academy of Modena. On the Genoese cardinal, see Guillaume Alonge, *Condottiero, cardinale, eretico. Federico Fregoso nella crisi politica e religiosa del Cinquecento*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2016.

12. PM, vol. II, p. 364.

13. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 524-26. The text of the catechism, on which see José C. Nieto, "Juan de *Valdés on Catechetical Instruction. The Dialogue on Christian Doctrine and the Christian Instruction for Children*," in "Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance," XXXVI (1974), pp. 253-72, is in Juan de Valdés, *Alfabeto cristiano. Domande e risposte. Della predestinazione. Catechismo*, edited by Massimo Firpo, Einaudi, Turin 1994, pp. 183 ff.

14. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*, letter to Carlo Gualteruzzi of 31 May 1542; see Gigliola Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga di Bernardino Ochino, in "Rivista storica italiana," LXXXIV (1972), pp. 777-813, also in idem, Cinquecento italiano, cited above, pp. 141-88, from which we quote, especially p. 154.

15. On the 5th Contarini wrote to Farnese to announce Elio's arrival "with the cap of the Most Reverend Monsignor of Modena, which, so that I might fully share in the joy I feel at this worthy promotion, fortune has arranged that the aforesaid Most Reverend is here with me and that I have placed it upon his head with my own hand" (ibid., p. 235); see also what Alvise Priuli wrote to Beccadelli on 14 June (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 205r-206v), and Morone's letters of thanks to Farnese of 5 June (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 283) and 14 June (ibid., 331); see also PM, vol. I, pp. 492-93. A few weeks later, on 7 July, Morone wrote to

Beccadelli that he would send someone to borrow some of Contarini's cardinal's garments so that their cut could be copied (PrBP, ms. Palatino 1020/1).

16. Thus wrote Girolamo Verallo, nuncio in Vienna, to Alessandro Farnese on 30 June 1542 (NB1, vol. VII, p. 216); many letters to the newly elected cardinal are in MiBA, ms. O 231 sup., ff. 1r ff. In addition to Pole's unpublished letter, dated Viterbo, 20 June, see the one Priuli addressed to Beccadelli on the 26th (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 24, ff. 211r-212v). Bembo's letter of 4 June is edited in Pietro Bembo, Lettere, edited by Ernesto Travi, 4 vols., Commissione per i testi di lingua, Bologna 1987-93, vol. IV, p. 414.

17. MiBA, ms. O 231 sup., ff. 120r, 121r, letters of 4 and 5 June.

18. On 7 June the governor of Modena, Francesco Villa, announced an imminent visit by Morone to the Este duke (MoBE, ms. Ital., 854, f. 191rv); that same day Morone apologized for not yet having been able to go to Ferrara (MoAS, *Carteggio principi esteri.* Roma, 1397/139).

19. Gregorii Cortesii, *Omnia, quae huc usque colligi potuerunt, sive ab eo scripta, sive ad illum spectantia*, 2 vols., Josephus Cominus, Patavii 1774, vol. I, p. 55.

20. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 262, where the city festivities are also described: "In truth this magnificent city is jubilant with joy at now having these three cardinals," to whom he added Rodolfo Pio da Carpi, Iacopo Sadoleto, and Ippolito d'Este, the duke's brother, "who may be counted among our Modenese"; see also ibid., pp. 270, 303.

21. See Contarini's letter to Farnese of 4 June: "There were no three men in the world outside that sacred college whom I loved and esteemed more than the three other brothers newly promoted by His Beatitude, namely the Most Reverend of Modena, who has been with me for three days and has received the honorable news here, a man of as rare goodness and prudence as any I have known; the master of the Sacred Palace; and the abbot of San Benedetto [Gregorio Cortese]. I hold it certain that not only in Italy, but even outside Italy, three such men could not be found" (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 283; edited in *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 215-16, and A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 232; see also pp. 233-34).

22. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 55-56. The following day Beccadelli wrote to Gualteruzzi to thank him for the "cardinalate news" of 30 May, "which by now must be clear. See what fortune has brought: yesterday the bishop of Modena arrived here and is here now, and God grant that he receive this news here for his and our consolation. May the Lord God grant us the great grace of having good men in that college who are our friends, as this man will be, and Don Gregorio [Cortese]" (MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*; see also the letter of 13 June). Finally, see Pole's letter of 10 June to Contarini, again rejoicing "at this trinity of new cardinals" (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 57), and Priuli's to Beccadelli (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 203r-204v).

23. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, f. 201r.

24. *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 39.

25. G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, pp. 155-58. On the political and religious significance of this cardinal creation, see also idem, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 70-71; *Il cardinale Gregorio Cortese*, cited above, pp. 89 ff.; and *Evangelismo e intransigenti*, cited above, pp. 196-98; P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 263-65; E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 227-28, 263 ff. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 163, is not wrong in maintaining that those appointments were "more a cosmetic operation and a concession to demands by then too widespread and urgent to ignore than an indication of Paul III's genuine reforming will"; the well-informed author of the *Lettera di fra Berardino a papa Paolo III* expressed the same view (ibid., pp. 231-32).

26. Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Inquisizione come repressione o Inquisizione come mediazione? Una proposta di periodizzazione*, in "Annuario dell'Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea," XXXV-XXXVI (1983-84), pp. 51-77, especially pp. 63 ff.; idem, "*Inquisitor as Mediator*," in Ronald K.

Delph, Michelle M. Fontaine, and John Jeffries Martin, eds., *Heresy, Culture, and Religion in Early Modern Italy. Contexts and* Contestations, Truman State University Press, Kirksville, MO, 2006, pp. 173-92.

27. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 262. The brief of appointment is published in PM, vol. II, pp. 347-48; see Farnese's letter to Morone announcing the news (MiBA, ms. O 231 sup., f. 6r).

28. See Contarini's letter of 6 June announcing Morone's departure (A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 237; Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 260, 262-63).

29. The parchment instrument was still preserved in the family archives in the mid-seventeenth century among various administrative documents, together with a bundle of letters written during the nunciatures in Germany and papers concerning his promotion to the cardinalate, as well as "a book entitled Register of the Dispatches Made by Monsignor Morone, Bishop of Modena" (MnAS, *Archivio Casati Stampa*, reg. 311, ff. 40v, 42v, 44v-45r).

30. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 353.

31. PM, vol. II, pp. 364-65.

32. The quotations are taken from the critical edition of this text published ibid., pp. 376 ff.; see p. 413; E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 284 ff.

33. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 266 ff.

34. PM, vol. II, pp. 392-93.

35. Ibid., p. 401.

36. Ibid., pp. 407-8.

37. Ibid., p. 411.

38. See the treatise *De poenitentia* sent shortly afterward to Pole (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, pp. 355, 358).

39. PM, vol. II, p. 393.

40. Ibid., pp. 413-14.

41. Ibid., p. 395.

42. Ibid., pp. 397-98.

43. See above, section III.3. On 14 June Cortese informed the Este duke that he had sent him a member of his household who "will explain our commissions to him" (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Carteggio principi esteri*, 1353/41). On 15 June Morone wrote to Beccadelli that Cortese would arrive only at the end of the month (PrBP, ms. Palatino, 1020/1).

44. ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 38, ff. 63r-67v; edited by G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese*, cited above, vol. VI, pp. 1-3; see the observations of G. Fragnito, *Il cardinale Gregorio Cortese*, cited above, pp. 96 ff.

45. On 30 December 1542, from Bologna, where a large heterodox group would shortly be discovered (Antonio Rotondò, *Per la storia dell'eresia a Bologna nel secolo XVI*, in "Rinascimento," XIII [1962], pp. 107-54, especially pp. 136 ff.; Guido Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori nella Bologna del Cinquecento*, Istituto per la storia di Bologna, Bologna 1999, pp. 109 ff.), Scipione Bianchini wrote to Beccadelli that he had "given our governor the Modena articles, which he asked me for" (G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, pp. 186-87; see pp. 181-82).

46. P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 104 ff.; idem, *Pietro Bembo e l'evangelismo* italiano, in "Critica storica," XV (1978), pp. 1-63, especially pp. 19 ff.

47. See the letters sent on 1 May by Pole to Contarini and by Priuli to Beccadelli (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 52-54; OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, f. 97v; Tommaso Bozza, *Nuovi studi sulla Riforma in Italia*, I. *Il Beneficio di Cristo*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1976, pp. 74-75; P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 118 ff.).

48. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. 4-5, 161; see *Marcantonio Flaminio*, *Apologia del* "Beneficio di Christo" e altri scritti inediti, edited by Dario Marcatto, Olschki, Florence 1996, p. 12; Massimo Firpo, Il "Beneficio di Christo" e il concilio di Trento (1542-1546), in idem, *Dal sacco di Roma all'Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 119-45, especially pp. 126-27. The correspondence between Flaminio and Bargellesi is confirmed by testimony given by Giovan Battista Scotti against the Florentine protonotary in 1560, when he would state, among other things, that he had seen some letters from Flaminio "written here in Bologna from Rome [...] to the Reverend Don Nicola Bargellese, in which, taking a certain occasion, he sought to introduce him to the way of his gospel, that is, to Lutheran doctrine" (ibid., p. 141); see also Bargellesi's deposition against *Vittore Soranzo* of 1551, edited in *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, pp. 152 ff. On Bargellesi, see PM, vol. I, p. 319, note 156; vol. II, pp. 1209 ff.; G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, index.

49. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 221r-222v; see Alessandro Pastore, *Marcantonio Flaminio. Fortune e sfortune di un chierico nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 1981, p. 129. Some time later Beccadelli would say that he had read the Beneficio "three years ago" (Benedetto da Mantova, *Il Beneficio di Cristo. Con le versioni del secolo XVI: documenti e testimonianze*, edited by Salvatore Caponetto, Sansoni-The Newberry Library, Florence-Chicago 1972, p. 435).

50. See below, section XXV.2.

51. On her, see below, section VI.1.

52. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 58.

53. Ibid., pp. 55-57, his letters to Contarini of 2 and 10 June.

54. See below, section V.2.

55. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 207r-210v; see G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, pp. 184-85; P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 123-24; M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 89-91.

56. On 26 June Priuli wrote to Beccadelli that "we have heard nothing else about the articles sent to Rome to the Most Reverend of the Minerva [Badia]" (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 211r-212v).

57. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 59.

58. Ibid., pp. 31-32.

59. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, pp. 353-61.

60. G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, pp. 155-58.

61. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 60. See also Priuli's contemporary letter to Beccadelli: "Monsignor [Pole] received the long, most learned, and most affectionate letters of Monsignor [Contarini] in reply. His Lordship has begun to answer him in order to try to satisfy him still better on the matter, since it is of such great importance and he has the opportunity to confer with such a man and such a friend. The lady marchioness wrote me the enclosed note the other day, which, if you think fit, you may show to His Most Reverend Lordship" (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 215r-216v). It is likely that this writing by Colonna also concerned the formula of faith, on which Contarini had called for a broad discussion by the entire Viterbo group.

62. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 61. In the customary letter sent in parallel to Beccadelli, Priuli informed him that the Venetian cardinal's request to be accompanied to Spain by one of Pole's household could not be granted, since all of them preferred, with various reasons and pretexts, to decline the invitation (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 217r-220v; see G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, p. 158, note 45). On this discussion between Pole and Contarini, see Dermot Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience in Tridentine Italy. Cardinal Pole and the Counter Reformation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1972, pp. 62 ff.; P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 122 ff.; E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 274-75. Contrary to all documentary evidence, T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 125 ff., instead maintains that in the Modenese affair Contarini not only displayed substantial doctrinal agreement with the cardinal of England, but even worked to keep united a reform party that at that date would also have

included Carafa and Cervini. A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 52-53, denies any disagreement between Contarini and Pole and any involvement of the latter alongside the Academy.

63. “I do not know whether a Latin text I sent you in recent days has reached you,” he wrote on 27 August, “of which I desired the opinion of that holy soul; if you have it, I should like you to send it back to me” (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 231r-232v). Beccadelli apparently complied with this request, since neither Colonna’s “note,” nor Pole’s judgment on Contarini’s formula of faith, nor his reply to the *De poenitentia*, the three writings mentioned here, are known today. In this regard it is worth noting that among Morone’s private papers seized at the time of his arrest, on 31 May 1557, there was also a copy of Contarini’s *De poenitentia* with autograph deletions and corrections by Beccadelli intended to turn the text into a kind of independent treatise, removing all the features of a private letter, namely the references to Pole and the Viterbo group (ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 22, ff. 41r-56v).

64. G. Fragnito, Gli “*spirituali*” e la fuga, cited above, pp. 275 ff. On 22 August, writing to Colonna to inform her of his decision to flee, Ochino expressed the desire to know “your judgment and that of the Most Reverend Monsignor Pole” (Karl Benrath, *Bernardino Ochino von Siena. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformation*, Schwetschke und Sohn, Braunschweig 1892, p. 288).

65. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, pp. 389-90.

66. On them it is enough to refer to PM, vol. I, p. 300, note 14; p. 944, note 322; p. 11, note 11, and the bibliographical references given there.

67. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, pp. 390-92.

68. Ibid., pp. 392-96.

69. Ibid., pp. 396-97.

70. PM, vol. II, pp. 365-67. During his trial the Milanese cardinal would declare that he had “greatly desired to be able to understand the opinions of some of these men of Modena on many articles in order to remedy them, which I was never able to do. And I used various means to achieve this, [...] nor by way of depositions could I ever find evidence against them” (ibid., vol. I, pp. 519-20; see also p. 572).

71. BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 12068, f. 235rv; see PM, vol. III, p. 135, note 2.

72. See Contarini’s letter to Sadoleto of 5 July (A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 256); see Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 280.

73. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 288; G. Fragnito, *Il cardinale Gregorio Cortese*, cited above, pp. 94 ff.

74. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. CCLXXXIV-CCLXXXVI.

75. PM, vol. II, pp. 349-50.

76. Ibid., pp. 353-54; see F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 353.

77. PM, vol. II, pp. 367-68.

78. Together with the repeatedly cited letter of 3 August, forwarded by Contarini, who wrote from Bologna to Farnese on the 5th, “Enclosed here will be a packet of letters from our Most Reverend Monsignor Morone” (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 283), Morone also sent to Rome a copy of the formula of faith in its first draft, with few and negligible variants from the final text later signed in Modena. It is on this copy (ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 16, ff. 27r-39v) that several important autograph annotations by Morone appear, which will now be discussed.

79. See what Lancillotti noted on 31 July, vol. VII, p. 326; see p. 328.

80. “Ego N. fateor me in nulla parte ab his dissentire quae in articulis supra contentis ex Christi et sanctorum Patrum verbis approbavit author articulorum reverendissimus cardinalis etc.”; or: “Ego N. fateor me in nulla parte dissentire ab his quae in articulis suprascriptis ex Christi et sanctorum Patrum verbis et ex usu et traditione sanctae romanae Ecclesiae author articulorum approbavit.”

81. “Ego N. fateor me legisse et considerasse suprascriptos articulos 41, quos orthodoxae fidei consonos et a catholica et romana Ecclesia receptos approbo et ab omnibus approbandos censeo”; or: “Ego N. legi suprascriptos articulos 41 et eos omnes approbans subscripsi.”

82. ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 16, f. 36r, where three annotations identify the texts proposed “per cardinalem Moronum,” “per reverendissimum Cortesium,” and “per eosdem Academicos”; see f. 37r.

83. PM, vol. II, pp. 368-70.

84. Ibid., p. 370.

85. Ibid., pp. 355-58.

86. Antonio Rotondò, *Atteggiamenti della vita morale italiana del Cinquecento. La pratica* nicodemitica, in “Rivista storica italiana,” LXXIX (1967), pp. 991-1030, now in idem, Studi *di storia ereticale del Cinquecento*, 2 vols., Olschki, Florence 2008, vol. I, pp. 201-47, especially p. 246; Cesare Bianco, *La comunità di* “fratelli” nel movimento ereticale modenese del ’500, in “Rivista storica italiana,” XCII (1980), pp. 621-79, especially pp. 665-66.

87. *Bullarium diplomatum et privilegiorum sanctorum romanorum pontificum*, 24 vols., Seb. Franco et Henrico Dalmazzo editoribus, Augustae Taurinorum 1857-62, vol. VI, pp. 344-46. The appointment of the six cardinal inquisitors had in fact taken place on 4 July (Philip McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy. An Anatomy of Apostasy*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1967, p. 248), but as early as 16 June the pope had discussed the Modenese events with “the Most Reverend Theatine and Burgos, appointed to the general Inquisition against Lutherans.” The duke hastened to instruct his ambassador to intervene with Carafa and Álvarez de Toledo, reminding them of his constant commitment against heresy: “Nor do we know,” he wrote, “what blame we can bear for Morone’s writing, since it is his office to provide for such cases or, when he cannot, to make them known to us” (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma*, 44). “Universal care of the Inquisition,” moreover, had already been entrusted by Paul III a year earlier, immediately after Contarini’s return from the Diet of Regensburg, to Cardinals Carafa and Aleandro, with explicit reference to the heresies widespread in Modena (see Ruggeri’s letter to Ercole II of 16 July 1541: ibid., 39; the duke’s reply, dated the 23rd, is ibid., 44; PM, vol. II, p. 992, note 568). On the birth of the Holy Office, see A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, pp. 35 ff.; Elena Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant’Uffizio. Penitenza, confessione e giustizia spirituale dal medioevo al XVI secolo*, il Mulino, Bologna 2001, pp. 347 ff.; Andrea Del Col, *L’Inquisizione in Italia. Dal XII al XXI secolo*, Mondadori, Milan 2006, pp. 284 ff.; G. Romeo, *L’Inquisizione nell’Italia moderna*, cited above, pp. 3 ff.

88. A. Vanni, “Fare diligente inquisitione,” cited above.

89. See below, section XIV.1.

90. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*, letter to Carlo Gualteruzzi of 15 July 1542; see G. Fragnito, Gli “*spirituali*” e la fuga, cited above, pp. 144-45 and note 11.

91. See above, section I.3.

92. “I do not know whether our Most Reverend Lord of the Minerva has ever seen those articles drawn up at the request of the Most Reverend Monsignor Morone for that unhealthy land of his. Monsignor [Contarini] would be glad to know his opinion,” Beccadelli urged in a letter to Gualteruzzi of 12 July (MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*).

93. Besides Carafa, the cardinals appointed to preside over the Roman Holy Office were Juan Álvarez de Toledo, Tommaso Badia, Bartolomeo Guidiccioni, Dionigi Laurerio, and *Pier Paolo* Parisio; Morone was therefore not among them, as is sometimes stated (A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, p. 45).

94. PM, vol. II, pp. 356-57; see also pp. 370-71, and Contarini’s letter to Pole of the 22nd, in which he wrote that Badia had read the articles and replied that he had found nothing unacceptable that needed correction (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 31-32).

95. PM, vol. II, pp. 371-72.

96. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico*: “Sed haec alias et cum melius liquebit” [but of this another time, when it will be clearer], he concluded.

97. Ibid.; see G. Fragnito, Gli “*spirituali*” e la fuga, cited above, pp. 168-70.

98. On 13 July Contarini asked Morone to urge Cortese not to delay his arrival (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 353), and on the 18th Priuli informed Beccadelli that he had “understood that the Most Reverend Lord Legate shortly expected the Most Reverend Cortese, who was in Modena” (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 213r-214v). But on the 29th Contarini wrote to an unspecified recipient, probably Morone himself, that “the Most Reverend Cortese has not yet arrived in Bologna and, from what he writes me, does not hope to be able to come here before his journey to Rome, which will be at the end of August or the beginning of September” (A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 271).

99. See what he wrote to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga on 29 July: “The Most Reverend Morone is laboring as much as he can to find some favorable turn for the religious troubles in Modena, over which His Most Reverend Lordship is most vigilant and omits no duty of a good father and shepherd. And from what the Most Reverend Cortese writes me, who plans to come at the beginning of September to kiss His Holiness’s feet, they hope to make some progress” (A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 270).

100. “I have not written to Your Most Reverend Lordship for many days,” Morone began, “because I wished to send you some resolution of these labors of ours in Modena, to assist which I have opportunely received Our Lord’s briefs, although the time has not yet seemed right to use them. I have only made use of them by making it known that I have them and by showing that His Holiness takes to heart the scandal of this city, and that if they do not take this peaceful path I have proposed to them and do not put an end to so many novelties, His Holiness, even charging me with the task, will send persons who will employ other methods against them than I have used. Meanwhile, with divine help and with much labor by the Most Reverend Cortese, we have brought them to promise that they will sign with us the articles drawn up by the Most Reverend Contarini. But the difficulty lies in the manner of the subscription, for which I hope we shall find some good outcome” (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, pp. 397-98).

101. See what Nino Sernini wrote from Rome to Cardinal Gonzaga on 8 July 1542: “His Holiness said he had understood that sects of Lutherans had been discovered in Lucca, Modena, and Parma, and I believe he also included Naples, and that it was necessary to remedy them. [...] There is greater doubt about Naples, and it is believed that the evil lies among the great; and the most corrupted place of all is Lucca” (Edmondo Solmi, *La fuga di Bernardino Ochino secondo i documenti dell’Archivio Gonzaga di Mantova*, in “Bullettino senese di storia patria,” XV [1908], pp. 23-98, especially p. 64).

102. This is what emerges from a memorial dated 2 August by the chancellor of the Community of Modena, Gentile Albino, who went to Ferrara on the governor Francesco Villa’s orders to confer with the duke on various matters, including the ongoing trial of strength between Morone and the Academy: “The said Most Reverend has truly proceeded with all possible dexterity, aided also by the work of the said governor, who has not failed to remind him that from the harshness employed by Cardinal Cajetan, legate in Germany, toward the Lutherans, that great conflagration which still burns today arose from a small spark, and that His Most Reverend Lordship should take care lest God should will and sometimes permit, because of the sins of the world, that by driving these men to despair, men of much intelligence and spirit and subtle mind, some other similar fire should arise in Italy” (PM, vol. II, p. 371, note 52; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 238).

103. “And although at present some silence may perhaps be imposed, nevertheless it will not endure unless there is someone who works continuously. In this connection,” Morone wrote, also raising Rome’s responsibilities, “it occurs to me humbly to recall that there many are granted permission to read Lutheran books and others from Germany, which is the cause of their perdition, as has happened in this city, where some of these contaminated men say that they read them with permission from the Penitentiary. All such permissions could profitably be revoked by Our Lord, or at least prohibited in the future, because in reading

these books anyone who is not very cautious is easily deceived under the appearance of piety" (F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 399).

104. Ibid., p. 398. On 9 July Contarini replied to Renée of France, who had expressed her "great desire [...] to have Don Pietro Martire as preacher for this Lent," saying that he regretted being unable to comply, "because the said father was promised many days ago to the Most Reverend Morone for his church in the city of Modena" (A. Casadei, Lettere, cited above, p. 258). "I thank Your Most Reverend Lordship for Don Pietro Martire," Morone had written to the Venetian cardinal on 3 July (Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. CCLXXXVI).

105. See above, note 100.

106. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 320-21 (28 July 1542). By this date the Modenese chronicler knew that "certain articles, no. 40, have been sent from Rome to the Most Reverend Cardinal Morone and bishop of Modena," which the Academy members would have to sign, "and those who do not wish to subscribe to them will be summoned to Rome, and God knows what will then follow."

107. PM, vol. II, pp. 372-73.

108. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 321, 325-28.

109. MoBE, *Autografoteca Campori*, *Beccadelli Ludovico*.

110. PM, vol. II, pp. 373-75.

111. MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Rettori dello Stato, Modena*, 57, letter of 13 August. The dispatches of the Este ambassador in Rome between mid-April and the end of July 1542 are missing.

112. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 343.

113. See Morone's letters to Beccadelli and Gheri from those weeks (PrBP, ms. Palatino, 1020/1).

114. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 343, 378. That same day Morone wrote to Alessandro Farnese to urge him to find positions for Contarini's household, first and foremost Beccadelli (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 331).

115. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 266, instead states this.

116. C. Bianco, *La comunità di* "fratelli," cited above, p. 666.

117. PM, vol. I, p. 333. Friar Bartolomeo della Pergola would testify thus in 1556, referring, however, to a meeting in Bologna with Castelvetro in 1544, when the latter probably told him what had happened in Modena two years earlier, perhaps to induce him too to "dissimulation" (see below, section VII.4).

118. M. Firpo, Rethinking "Catholic Reform," cited above.

119. Appointed legate in France on the 10th, Sadoleto had left Rome on the 17th (R. M. Douglas, *Jacopo Sadoleto*, cited above, p. 170; Fernand Benoît, *La légation du cardinal Sadolet auprès de François Ier en 1542 d'après sa correspondance avec le cardinal Farnèse*, Imprimerie de Monaco-Librairie Auguste Picard, Monaco-Paris 1928, pp. 8-9). On the welcome accorded him upon his arrival in Modena, see Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 346.

120. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 351, gives a detailed account under the date 3 September 1542.

121. Ibid., p. 348.

122. PM, vol. II, p. 414. Lancillotti repeatedly refers to the "articles of faith that His Holiness the pope sent to Modena," vol. VII, pp. 326, 320, 327, 342, 348, 349, 351, 357.

123. PM, vol. II, pp. 415-16.

124. Ibid., pp. 416 ff.: "I, N., approve all these articles and hold that they should be approved by all, always submitting myself, however, in this as in every other matter, to the judgment of the holy Catholic and Roman Church" ("ego N. hos omnes articulos approbo et approbandos censeo, subiiciens tamen me semper et in his et caeteris omnibus iudicio sanctae catholicae et romanae Ecclesiae").

125. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 348; Modena, ASC, Vacchette, 1542, f. 130r.

126. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 358.

127. Only in 1547, moreover, would he be able to see that document with the signatures at the foot (ibid., pp. 352-53).

128. Ibid., pp. 349, 358.

129. PM, vol. II, p. 417, note 226.

130. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 224-25.

131. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 357.

132. Angelo Mercati, *Il sommario del processo di Giordano Bruno. Con appendice di documenti sull'eresia e l'Inquisizione a Modena nel secolo XVI*, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1942, pp. 137-39.

133. On him, see PM, vol. II, p. 896 and note 163.

134. Lancillotti, vol. VII, p. 113; on him, see PM, vol. I, p. 298, note 9.

135. See PM, vol. I, p. 930 and notes 273-74.

136. See ibid., p. 892 and note 146.

137. See ibid., pp. 912 ff. and note 230.

138. See ibid., pp. 854 ff. and note 20.

139. See above, section III.2.

140. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. 15.

141. Ibid., vol. VII, p. 352.

142. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 396.

143. PM, vol. II, p. 415.

144. On the subsequent development of the Modenese heretical movement, see C. Bianco, *La comunità di* "fratelli," cited above; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 261 ff.; M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above.

145. Matteo Al Kalak, *Carità e circuiti di assistenza clandestina nella comunità eterodossa modenese (1540-1570)*, in "Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi," XXXIII (2011), pp. 104-17.

146. PM, vol. II, pp. 437-52.

147. See below, section VII.1.

V. "Enlightened by the Most Reverend Pole": Trent and the Encounter with the Spirituali

1. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 385, 388; see Morone's letter to Alessandro Farnese of 19 September 1542, in which he announced his departure from Modena "within eight or ten days" (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 331).

2. CT, vol. IV, pp. 275-76.

3. MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 1912, ff. 268r-273v.

4. On 17 October Priuli informed Beccadelli of Roman rumors that Parisio, Morone, and Badia would be appointed, without mentioning Pole (OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 251r-254v), whose appointment he learned of only on the 19th (ibid., ff. 260r-262v).

5. Niccolò Del Re, *Pier Paolo Parisio giurista e cardinale (1473-1545)*, in “Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia,” XXIV (1970), pp. 465-88.

6. On him, see T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, on which see Massimo Firpo, *Note su una biografia di Reginald Pole*, in “Rivista storica italiana,” CXIII (2001), pp. 859-74; and P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above.

7. T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 13 ff.

8. See above, section II.2, note 63; A. Aubert, Il “Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia,” cited above.

9. PM, vol. I, p. 102, note 39.

10. See Davide Romano’s unpublished doctoral dissertation, *Church Reform without the Church: Reginald Pole’s Experience in Italy (1521-1553)*, defended at the European University Institute in 2015.

11. PM, vol. I, pp. 773-74.

12. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 840, 883.

13. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 426; see also the letter of 10 November, again to Alessandro Farnese, dated from San Michele in Bosco near Bologna, while Morone was in Modena on 9 and 10 November (PM, vol. I, p. 434, note 193).

14. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 24, ff. 40r-42v, Gualteruzzi’s letter to Beccadelli of 30 August 1542; see ff. 45r-46v, the subsequent letter of 11 October, in which he raised the possibility of the Milanese cardinal’s imminent appointment to the conciliar legation; see there, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 249r-250v; PM, vol. I, p. 434, note 193.

15. PM, vol. I, p. 434: “I still had little knowledge of the aforesaid Most Reverend Pole, because before he became a cardinal I had seen him only once, while passing through Viterbo, where His Most Reverend Lordship was legate.” See Cervini’s letter of 14 December 1541, sent in reply to one from Morone dated two days earlier from Viterbo (ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 39, f. 298rv), where Pole was then staying; Pole had written to Contarini on the 9th (BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 5826, f. 116rv) and to Farnese on the 12th (George B. Parks, “*The Parma Letters and the Dangers to Cardinal Pole*,” in “The Catholic Historical Review,” XLVI [1960], pp. 299-317, especially p. 302).

16. See above, section IV.4.

17. PM, vol. I, p. 769 and note 4.

18. The bull of appointment is edited in CT, vol. IV, pp. 261-62; PM, vol. II, pp. 426-27; M. Al Kalak, “La città di tutte l’heresie,” cited above, pp. 167-68.

19. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 260r-262v; see also there, ff. 251r-254v, the letter of 17 October.

20. CT, vol. I, p. 418; vol. IV, p. 284, note 1; see Jedin, vol. I, p. 519; OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 260r-262v. Pole was the first to depart.

21. PM, vol. I, p. 513; for what follows, see ibid., note 38; vol. II, p. 154.

22. Lancillotti, vol. VII, pp. 396-97, 399.

23. See the letter Nino Sernini sent to the cardinal of Mantua on 28 October 1542 (MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 1912, f. 286r).

24. Ibid., 2532, f. 117r.

25. PrAS, *Epistolario scelto*, 13, *Pole Reginald*; see G. B. Parks, “*The Parma Letters*,” cited above, pp. 302-3.

26. PM, vol. I, pp. 508-10, 514-17.

27. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 588; see also there Morone’s letter to Alessandro Farnese dated Rovereto, 19 November; CT, vol. IV, pp. 285-87.

28. On him, see PM, vol. I, p. 3, note 1, and the text of his depositions against Morone, ibid., pp. 3 ff., 203 ff., 687 ff., and below, section XIV.2.

29. PM, vol. I, pp. 690-91.

30. Ibid., pp. 216-27; see pp. 8, 231-32, 690-91.

31. Ibid., pp. 515-16.

32. Ibid., pp. 518, 520.

33. See above, section II.5.

34. M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, pp. 143 ff., 195 ff. On him it is enough to refer to Alessandro Pastore, *Marcantonio Flaminio*, cited above; *Marcantonio Flaminio* (Serravalle 1498-Rome *1550) nel 5o centenario della nascita*, proceedings of the conference (Vittorio Veneto, 27-28 November 1998), edited by Alessandro Pastore and Aldo Toffoli, Comunità Montana delle Prealpi Trevigiane, Vittorio Veneto 2001; and the editions of *Marcantonio Flaminio*, Lettere, edited by Alessandro Pastore, Edizioni dell'Ateneo & Bizzarri, Rome 1978; idem, Carmina, edited by Massimo Scorsone, Res, Turin 1993.

35. Hubert Jedin, *Ein Streit um den Augustinismus vor dem Tridentinum (1537-1543)*, in "Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte," XXXV (1927), pp. 351-68; see A. Pastore, *Marcantonio Flaminio*, cited above, pp. 90 ff.

36. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 1111-12.

37. Ibid., pp. 559-61.

38. *Marcantonio Flaminio, Meditationi et orationi formate sopra l'epistola di san Paolo ai* romani, edited by Massimo Firpo, Aragno, Turin 2007.

39. PM, vol. I, p. 827.

40. Susanna Peyronel Rambaldi, *Una gentildonna irrequieta. Giulia Gonzaga fra reti familiari e relazioni eterodosse*, Viella, Rome 2012.

41. PM, vol. I, p. 810; see Flaminio's letter to Gonzaga of 14 January 1542 in M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, p. 206.

42. OBL, ms. Ital., C. 25, ff. 190r-193v; see A. Pastore, *Marcantonio Flaminio*, cited above, p. 119.

43. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1031; see also the documentation cited in M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, p. 8, and Flaminio's letter to Giovan Battista Scotti published in PM, vol. I, pp. 1074-75.

44. PM, vol. I, pp. 817-18.

45. Ibid., p. 821.

46. Ibid., p. 828.

47. Ibid., p. 823.

48. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1034.

49. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 42; see also ibid., pp. 44, 52, and M. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, p. 123.

50. PM, vol. I, p. 591.

51. Pasquale Lopez, *Il movimento valdesiano a Napoli. Mario Galeota e le sue vicende col* Sant'Uffizio, Fiorentino, Naples 1976, p. 152.

52. PrAS, *Gonzaga di Guastalla*, 42/7-8, letter from Ferrante Gonzaga to Charles V of 20 October 1551.

53. P. Lopez, *Il movimento valdesiano*, cited above, pp. 152, 172.

54. Here we limit ourselves to referring to the fundamental studies by José C. Nieto, *Juan de Valdés y los orígenes de la Reforma en España e Italia*, 2nd ed., Fondo de cultura económica, Mexico City-Madrid-Buenos Aires 1979, and Carlos Gilly, *Juan de Valdés. Übersetzer und* Bearbeiter von Luthers Schriften in seinem "Diálogo de doctrina," in "Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte," LXXIV (1983), pp. 257-305. For

what follows, see the studies by Massimo Firpo, Tra alumbrados e "*spirituali*." Studi su Juan de Valdés e il *valdesianesimo nella crisi religiosa del '500 italiano*, Olschki, Florence 1990; *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma*, cited above, pp. 3 ff.; *Valdesiani e spirituali. Studi sul Cinquecento religioso italiano*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2013, pp. 39 ff., 73 ff.; *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 62 ff. See Juan de Valdés, Two Catechisms. The "Dialogue on Christian Doctrine" and the "*Christian Instruction for Children*," edited by José C. Nieto, Coronado Press, Lawrence, KS, 1981.

55. See the introduction to Juan de Valdés, *Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*, edited by Marcel Bataillon, Imprensa de Universidade, Coimbra 1925, of which there is a new edition: Marcel Bataillon, *Introduction au Diálogo de doctrina cristiana de Juan de Valdés* (1529), preface by Jean-Robert Armogathe, Vrin, Paris 1981; and the detailed analysis of the work by Anthony Santiso, Une foi composite. Le "*Diálogo de doctrina cristiana*" de Juan de Valdés, Garnier, Paris 2014.

56. From an enormous bibliography, we limit ourselves to Antonio Márquez, *Los alumbrados. Orígenes y filosofía (1525-1559)*, 2nd ed., Taurus, Madrid 1980; Alastair Hamilton, *Heresy and* Mysticism in Sixteenth-Century Spain. The "Alumbrados," James Clarke & Co., Cambridge 1992; and Stefania Pastore, *Un'eresia spagnola. Spiritualità conversa, alumbradismo e Inquisizione (1449-1559)*, Olschki, Florence 2004.

57. M. Firpo, *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma*, cited above, pp. 20 ff.

58. Cano's Censura was published by Fermín Caballero, *Conquénses ilustres*, II. *Vida del il.mo Melchor Cano*, Impr. del Colegio nacional de sordo-mudos, Madrid 1871, pp. 536-615; see Antonio Márquez, *Origen y caracterización del iluminismo (según un parecer de Melchor Cano)*, in "Revista de Occidente," no. 63 (1968), pp. 320-33; Melquíades Andrés Martín, *Nueva visión de los "alumbrados" de 1525*, Fundación universitaria española, Madrid 1973, especially p. 37.

59. Juan de Valdés, *Il dialogo della dottrina cristiana*, edited by Teodoro Fanlo y Cortés, preface by Anna Morisi Guerra, Claudiana, Turin 1991, pp. 37 ff.

60. Ibid., pp. 27, 32, 64, 69.

61. Ibid., p. 30; see pp. 72-73.

62. Ibid., pp. 34, 44, 76, 88; see p. 79, where Valdés affirms the need to confess at least once a year "only to perform our duty toward the Church," revealing only that "of which our conscience accuses us."

63. Daniel A. Crews, *Twilight of Renaissance. The Life of Juan de Valdés*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2008, pp. 47 ff.

64. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 14; *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, p. 331; S. Pagano, Il processo, cited above, pp. 259, 298.

65. *Cartas inéditas de Juan de Valdés al cardenal Gonzaga*, edited by José F. Montesinos, S. Aguirre, Madrid 1931, p. 41.

66. Marcel Bataillon, *Erasme et l'Espagne*, edited by Daniel Devoto and Charles Amiel, 3 vols., Droz, Geneva 1991, vol. I, p. 390.

67. Juan de Valdés, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, edited by Teodoro Fanlo y Cortés, Marietti, Genoa-Milan 2004, pp. 278-80, 324-27.

68. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 1185-86; see pp. 319-21.

69. Juan de Valdés, *Modo che si dee tenere ne l'insegnare et predicare il principio della religione christiana*, edited in M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, pp. 143-93, especially p. 192.

70. Juan de Valdés, *Domande e risposte*, edited in idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, pp. 113-69, especially pp. 115-18, *In che maniera il christiano ha da studiare nel suo proprio libro et che frutto ha da trahere dallo studio, et come la santa Scrittura gli serve per interprete o* commentario.

71. Idem, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, cited above, pp. 246-47; see pp. 257-62.

72. Idem, *La epístola de san Pablo a los romanos i la I. a los corintios*, [edited by Luis Usoz y Río, n.p., Madrid] 1856, [1 Cor.], p. 65.

73. Idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, cited above, p. 65; and idem, *Lo evangelio di san Matteo*, edited by Carlo Ossola, Bulzoni, Rome 1985, p. 161.

74. Idem, *Modo che si dee tenere*, cited above, pp. 143, 155-56, 161.

75. Idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, cited above, p. 60; and *La epístola de san Pablo*, cited above, [1 Cor.], pp. 35, 37.

76. Idem, *La epístola de san Pablo*, cited above, [1 Cor.], p. 143; see p. 167; idem, *Lo evangelio di san Matteo*, cited above, p. 218.

77. Idem, *La epístola de san Pablo*, cited above, [Rom.], unnumbered pages (Argumento), 92, 282, 299.

78. Idem, *Modo che si dee tenere*, cited above, pp. 158-60.

79. Idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, cited above, p. 71.

80. The fine observation is by Adriano Prosperi in the introduction to his edition of the *Alfabeto cristiano* (Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Rome 1988, p. 13).

81. Juan de Valdés, *Qual maniera si devrebbe tenere a informare insino dalla fanciullezza i figliuoli de' christiani delle cose della religione*, edited in idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, cited above, pp. 183-201, especially p. 185.

82. Luca Addante, *Eretici e libertini nel Cinquecento italiano*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2010; idem, *Valentino Gentile e il dissenso religioso nel Cinquecento. Dalla Riforma italiana al radicalismo europeo*, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa 2014.

83. J. de Valdés, *Domande e risposte*, cited above, p. 127.

84. Idem, *Lo evangelio di san Matteo*, cited above, pp. 372-74, 445.

85. Idem, *Domande e risposte*, cited above, p. 125; see p. 118.

86. Idem, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, cited above, pp. 362-63; see idem, *Lo evangelio di san Matteo*, cited above, pp. 213-14.

87. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 1111-13.

88. Ibid., pp. 567-68.

89. Ibid., pp. 91-92.

90. Ibid., pp. 1112, 1185-86.

91. J. de Valdés, *Qual maniera*, cited above, pp. 200-1.

92. Idem, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, cited above, pp. 209, 212-13.

93. Idem, *Alfabeto cristiano*, cited above, p. 88.

94. Idem, *Lo evangelio di san Matteo*, cited above, p. 158; see pp. 213-14, 218, 260, 445.

95. Idem, *La epístola de san Pablo*, cited above, [1 Cor.], pp. 153-54; [Rom.], p. 275.

96. Iacopo Bonfadio, *Le lettere e una scrittura burlesca*, edited by Aulo Greco, Bonacci, Rome 1978, pp. 91-92.

97. [*Pier Paolo* Vergerio], *Il catalogo de' libri li quali nuovamente nel mese di maggio nell'anno presente 1549 sono stati condannati et scomunicati per heretici da monsignor Giovan Della Casa, legato di Vinetia, et d'alcuni frati*, n.p. [1549], pp. hiiiv-hvr, hiiiv-hiiiir. The short treatise is edited in *Pier Paolo* Vergerio, *Scritti capodistriani e del primo anno dell'esilio*, II. *Il catalogo de' libri (1549)*, edited by Ugo Rozzo, Deputazione di storia patria per la Venezia Giulia, Trieste 2010; see also Rozzo's *Pier Paolo Vergerio censore degli Indici dei libri proibiti*, in *Pier Paolo Vergerio il Giovane*, cited above, pp. 143-206.

98. J. de Valdés, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni*, cited above, p. 158.

99. M. Firpo, *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma*, cited above, pp. 233 ff.

100. F. Negri, Tragedia, cited above, pp. [B6]v-[B7]r.

101. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 144.

102. Ibid., pp. 557-58; see also pp. 568, 656.

103. M. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, pp. 136-37; see also pp. 161-63, and M. Firpo, *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 111-13.

104. See 1 Kings 19:18.

105. J. de Valdés, *La epístola de san Pablo*, cited above, [Rom.], p. 205; see *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 566-67.

106. PM, vol. I, p. 819.

107. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 557-58; see *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, p. 189.

108. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 756.

109. See below, section VI.1.

110. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 599-600; on Orsini, see Giovanni Miccoli, *La storia* religiosa, in *Storia d'Italia*, edited by Ruggiero Romano and Corrado Vivanti, vol. II/1, Einaudi, Turin 1974, pp. 431-1079, especially pp. 1049 ff.; Giampiero Brunelli, "'Sopra tutto fu inclinatissimo alla religione.' La 'Vita dell'illustrissimo signor Camillo Orsino' *di Giuseppe Orologi*," in "Nunc alia tempora, alii mores." Storici e storia in età postridentina, proceedings of the conference (Turin, 24-27 September 2003), edited by Massimo Firpo, Olschki, Florence 2005, pp. 429-52.

111. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1232; see D. Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, cited above, pp. 161 ff.; T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 143 ff.

112. NB1, vol. XV, pp. 184-85.

113. M. Firpo, *Nel labirinto del mondo*, cited above, pp. 110 ff.; see below, sections XI.1 and XIV.3.

114. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 209-10.

115. See John 1:47.

116. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 213 ff.; see also pp. 260-62.

117. Ibid., pp. 215-16; see Massimo Firpo, *Storie di immagini. Immagini di storia. Studi di iconografia cinquecentesca*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2010, pp. 169-71.

118. Giovan Battista Scotti would nevertheless say that he believed Pole had drawn all the consequences implicit in the doctrine of justification by faith alone: "As for purgatory and suffrages for the faithful departed, indulgences, the invocation of saints, vows, and other Lutheran articles, I conjecture that the Most Reverend Cardinal Pole agreed with the Lutherans" (PM, vol. I, p. 214).

119. Ibid., pp. 424-25.

120. Ibid., p. 827.

121. Ibid., p. 828 (italics added); see p. 825. Merenda's words contradict what Carnesecchi would later say, asserting that the Valdesian doctrine "was not regarded by me, by the lady, or by anyone else I know of at that time, when it was accepted by us, as anything but good and Catholic, although it was not universally known or held by everyone; nor did it appear to contain anything scandalous or contrary to the Catholic religion, even though, from the inferences later drawn by some who were subtler and more speculative than either the lady or I, it appears to have been found otherwise" (*Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 569).

122. See above, section IV.1.

123. See below, section VII.1.

124. PM, vol. I, p. 91; see pp. 148, 179, 396-97.

125. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 298.

126. CT, vol. II, p. 415.

127. M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, pp. 200 ff.

128. M. Firpo, Il "Beneficio di Christo" e il concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 126 ff.; see M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, pp. 7 ff.

129. PM, vol. I, p. 594.

130. Ibid., pp. 759-60, 788-89; see, however, vol. II, pp. 730-32, Giacomelli's retraction, entered into the record on 24 August 1559, immediately after the death of Pope Carafa. In the new political and religious context that had arisen, he sought to clarify that Morone's statements were to be understood "as disputational and not assertive," and that at Trent he had heard him say that he would rather be thrown into the Adige than believe anything contrary to the Apostolic See.

131. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 611, note.

132. PM, vol. I, p. 670.

133. Ibid., p. 656.

134. M. Firpo, Tra alumbrados e "*spirituali*," cited above, pp. 43 ff.

135. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 323-24; see also p. 1224.

136. Ibid., pp. 324-25.

137. PM, vol. I, pp. 101-3, 672; see ibid., pp. 1257-59, 1273 ff., Morando's own explanations.

138. Ibid., p. 773. A few years later, the ever-caustic Paolo Giovio would describe Morone as “reformed” even before Abraham was born (P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 215). Heinrich Lutz, for example, presents him as the “reformer” par excellence in *Kardinal Morone. Reform, Konzil und Staatenwelt*, in *Il concilio di Trento e la riforma* tridentina, Proceedings of the conference (Trent, 2-6 September 1963), 2 vols., Herder, Rome-Freiburg-Basel-Barcelona-Vienna 1965, vol. I, pp. 363-81.

139. PM, vol. I, pp. 778-79.

140. On him, see ibid., p. 385, note 158.

141. Ibid., pp. 775-76; see also pp. 782-84, Morone’s reticent answers to the inquisitors’ questions about this affair, on which see Grechetto’s own letter to Cervini of 13 October 1554 (Gottfried Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, F. Schöningh, Paderborn 1910, p. 97, note 3).

142. PM, vol. I, p. 529.

143. Ibid., p. 426.

144. Giorgio Caravale, *Predicazione e Inquisizione nell’Italia del Cinquecento. Ippolito Chizzola tra eresia e controversia antiprotestante*, il Mulino, Bologna 2012, p. 45.

145. PM, vol. I, pp. 447-48.

146. Ibid., p. 698.

147. Ibid., p. 827.

148. M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, pp. 13 ff.; see PM, vol. I, pp. 521 ff., 537 ff.

149. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 404; see p. 391.

150. PM, vol. I, pp. 527-28.

151. Ibid., p. 426.

152. The *Paraphrasis in duo et triginta Psalmos*, published by Flaminio in Venice in 1538 and dedicated to Paul III, the *Paraphrasis in triginta Psalmos*, which appeared in Venice in 1546 and was dedicated to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, and the *In librum Psalmorum brevis explanatio*, published the previous year (A. Pastore, *Marcantonio Flaminio*, cited above, pp. 60 ff., 142 ff.). A copy of an otherwise unspecified *Paraphrasis in Psalmos* by *Marcantonio Flaminio* was seized from Morone at the time of his arrest (PM, vol. II, p. 28).

153. PM, vol. I, pp. 421-22.

154. Ibid., p. 539. Among the Psalms he chose, all centered on God’s mercy, Morone would recall Psalm 22, *Dominus reget me et nihil mihi deerit*; Psalm 33, *Benedicam Dominum in omni tempore*; Psalm 88, *Misericordias Domini in aeternum cantabo*; Psalm 116, *Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*; and Psalm 125, *In convertendo Dominum captivitatem Sion facti sumus sicut consolati*.

155. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 169r-174v.

156. Davide Romano, *Reginald Pole tra Erasmo e Valdés*. Dal “De unitate Ecclesiae” alle *meditazioni sui salmi (1536-1541)*, in Rivista storica italiana, CXXIV (2012), pp. 831-75.

157. T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 67-69, 116 ff.

158. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, ed., *Fray Bartolomé Carranza. Documentos* históricos, 7 vols., Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid 1962-94, vol. II/2, pp. 945-46; see D. Romano, *Reginald Pole tra Erasmo e Valdés*, cited above, p. 837 and note 20.

159. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 92.

160. Juan de Valdés, *Comentario a los Salmos*, ed. Manuel Carrasco, Librería nacional y extranjera, Madrid 1885; see Giovanni Ferroni, “Siculis et tarentinis.” Teologia, esegesi e poetica nei “De rebus divinis

carmina" di Flaminio, in Bollettino della Società di studi valdesi, no. 218 (2016), pp. 33-70, especially pp. 49 ff.

161. Élise Boillet, *L'Arétin et la Bible*, Droz, Geneva 2007, pp. 227 ff.

162. See below, section VII.4.

VI. "Spiritual Conversation": Giovanni Morone and *Vittoria Colonna*

1. Alessandro Luzio, *Vittoria Colonna*, in Rivista storica mantovana, I (1885), pp. 1-52, especially p. 26.

2. *Vittoria Colonna*, Carteggio, ed. Ermanno Ferrero and Giuseppe Müller, 2nd ed., ed. Domenico Tordi, Loescher, Turin 1892, p. 157.

3. Bartolommeo Fontana, *Documenti vaticani di Vittoria Colonna marchesa di Pescara per la difesa dei cappuccini*, in Archivio della Società romana di storia patria, IX (1886), pp. 343-71; Concetta Ranieri, "Si san Francesco fu eretico li suoi imitatori son luterani." *Vittoria Colonna* e la riforma dei cappuccini, in *Ludovico da Fossombrone e l'ordine dei cappuccini*, Proceedings of the conference (Fossombrone 1993), ed. Vincenzo Criscuolo, Istituto storico dei cappuccini, Rome 1994, pp. 337-51; see also Pietro Tacchi Venturi, *Vittoria Colonna fautrice della Riforma Cattolica secondo alcune sue lettere inedite*, in Studi e documenti di storia e diritto, XXII (1901), pp. 149-79 (see also pp. 307-14), especially pp. 158 ff.

4. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 239. On 21 June 1541, in a letter sent from Orvieto to the Cardinal of England, Colonna acknowledged that she was "extremely indebted to him, both in spiritual and temporal matters, for in this time of my need and exile he has consoled, helped, supported, and accommodated me above all others" (Sergio Pagano and Concetta Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti su Vittoria Colonna e Reginald Pole*, Vatican Secret Archives, Vatican City 1989, p. 95; see also pp. 104-5).

5. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 429.

6. Ibid., pp. 1034-35. As late as November 1543, Bembo, writing to Gualteruzzi, asked him to urge Colonna "to take care to preserve herself and not seek death through fasting and abstinence, and to remember that the longer she lives, the longer she will serve His Majesty" (P. Simoncelli, *Pietro Bembo*, cited above, p. 56).

7. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 559 ff.; see pp. 566 ff., 1034-36.

8. PM, vol. I, pp. 19-20.

9. Ibid., pp. 213-14, 230.

10. Ibid., p. 819.

11. Ibid., p. 828.

12. Ibid., pp. 468-70.

13. Ibid., p. 77; see pp. 81-82.

14. Ibid., p. 1019; see S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 140-41. On Colonna's faith, see Francesco Gui, *L'attesa del concilio. Vittoria Colonna e Reginald Pole* nel movimento degli "*spirituali*," Eue, Rome 1998; Carlo De Frede, *Vittoria Colonna e il suo processo inquisitoriale postumo*, now in Id., *Religiosità e cultura nel Cinquecento* italiano, Istituto italiano per gli studi storici-il Mulino, Naples 1999, pp. 51-94; Gigliola Fragnito, *Die religiöse Heterodoxie in Italien und Vittoria Colonna*, in *Vittoria Colonna Dichterin und Muse Michelangelos*, Exhibition catalogue, ed. Sylvia Ferino-Pagden, Kunsthistorisches Museum-Skira, Vienna 1997, pp. 225-34; Id., *Vittoria Colonna e il dissenso religioso*, in *Vittoria Colonna e Michelangelo*, ed. Pina Ragionieri, Mandragora, Florence 2005, pp. 97-105; Giovanni Bardazzi, *Le rime spirituali di Vittoria Colonna e Bernardino Ochino*, in Italique, IV (2001), pp. 61-101; Michele Camaioni, Per "sfiammeggiar di un vivo e ardente amore." *Vittoria Colonna*, *Bernardino Ochino* e *la Maddalena*, in Maria Lupi and Claudio Rolle, eds., *El Orbe Católico. Transformaciones, continuidades,*

contrastes y sentimientos de la religiosidad entre Europa y América (siglos IV-XIX), Ril, Santiago, Chile, 2016, pp. 105-60.

15. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 187.

16. Ibid., pp. 185 ff., 191 ff.; S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 108 ff.; PM, vol. III, pp. 560 ff.; see Barry Collett, *A Long and Troubled Pilgrimage. The Correspondence of Marguerite d'Angoulême and Vittoria Colonna 1540-1545*, Theological Seminary, Princeton 2000.

17. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 204, note; see Carlo Dionisotti, *Scritti sul Bembo*, ed. Claudio Vela, Einaudi, Turin 2002, pp. 133 ff.

18. The Marchioness of Pescara wrote to him in these terms on 23 July 1546 (PM, vol. II, pp. 556-57); see *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 429 ff.; V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 231 ff.

19. C. Dionisotti, *Scritti sul Bembo*, cited above, p. 127.

20. PM, vol. III, pp. 551-52.

21. *Vittoria Colonna*, Rime, ed. Alan Bullock, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1982, pp. 92 (no. 15), 103 (no. 37), 124 (no. 78), 144 (no. 118), and passim.

22. Ibid., pp. 99 (no. 29), 118 (no. 66), and passim.

23. Ibid., p. 105 (no. 41), and passim. On Colonna's *Rime spirituali*, see Rinaldina Russell, *The Mind's Pursuit of Divine. A Survey of Secular and Religious Themes in Vittoria Colonna's Sonnets*, in Forum Italicum, XXVI (1992), pp. 14-27; and Id., L'ultima meditazione di *Vittoria Colonna* e l'"Ecclesia viterbiensis," in *Presenze eterodosse nel Viterbese tra Quattro e Cinquecento*, Proceedings of the conference (Viterbo, 2-3 December 1996), ed. Vincenzo De Caprio and Concetta Ranieri, Archivio Guido Izzi, Rome 2000, pp. 213-32; Abigail Brundin, *Vittoria Colonna and the Spiritual Poetics of the Italian* Reformation, Ashgate, Aldershot 2008; Maria Serena Sapegno, ed., *Al crocevia della storia. Poesia, religione e politica in Vittoria Colonna*, Viella, Rome 2016; Abigail Brundin, Tatiana Crivelli, and Maria Teresa Sapegno, eds., *A Companion to Vittoria* Colonna, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2016; Ramie Targoff, *Renaissance Woman. The Life of Vittoria Colonna*, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York 2018. Similar themes naturally recur in the Marchioness of Pescara's prose writings as well.

24. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 239.

25. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1034.

26. Benedetto Varchi, Opere, ed. Antonio Racheli, 2 vols., Lloyd Austriaco-E. Treves, Trieste-Milan 1858-59, vol. II, p. 908.

27. PM, vol. III, pp. 567 ff.

28. See above, section V.2.

29. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 431-32: "I believe I gathered, from reading some of her sonnets, that she held predestination absolutely, though I cannot say precisely in what manner."

30. Ibid., pp. 430-31; see also pp. 1030-31.

31. S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, p. 105; PM, vol. III, p. 557.

32. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 252.

33. Colonna's Meditationi, clearly inspired by Valdés and Flaminio, probably date from her Viterbo period. These include the meditation "on the Gospel of the adulteress," published ibid., pp. 241 ff.; the Meditatione del Venerdì santo and *Meditatione sopra l'Ave* Maria, republished by P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 423 ff. (see also pp. 209 ff.); and, finally, the texts published by Bartolommeo Fontana, *Nuovi documenti vaticani intorno a Vittoria Colonna*, in Archivio della Società romana di storia patria, X (1887), pp. 595-628, especially pp. 611-24, provided that their attribution to Colonna can be established - in the case of the first of the two, some doubt is legitimate: see PM, vol. I, p. 724 and note 101 - and in S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 119 ff.

34. P. Bembo, Lettere, cited above, vol. IV, p. 356; see also p. 359. On Colonna's stay in Orvieto between March and July 1541, during the rebellion of her brother Ascanio against Paul III, see Domenico Tordi, *Vittoria Colonna in Orvieto durante la guerra del* sale, in Bollettino della Società umbra di storia patria, I (1895), pp. 473-533.

35. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 175r-178v; see P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, p. 112.

36. PM, vol. I, pp. 71-74, 665-66 and note 100. On the relations between Colonna and Contarini, see Stephen Bowd, *Prudential Friendship and Religious Reform. Vittoria Colonna and Gasparo Contarini*, in A. Brundin, T. Crivelli, and M. T. Sapegno, eds., *A Companion to Vittoria* Colonna, cited above, pp. 349-70.

37. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, pp. 53-54.

38. Ibid., pp. 58-59; see also Priuli's letters to Beccadelli of 1 May and 26 June (OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 196r-198v, 211r-212v).

39. See above, section IV.2.

40. F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe*, cited above, p. 361.

41. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 215r-216v. As early as 25 March of that year, Priuli had sent Beccadelli "a sweet and affectionate note just received from the lady marchioness" (ibid., ff. 186r-187v).

42. See Priuli's letters to Beccadelli of 22 and 24 August (ibid., ff. 225r-226v, 229r-230v; see also ff. 231r-232v), and the letter of consolation she sent to Sister Serafina Contarini (V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 249 ff.).

43. Pole, Epistolae, vol. III, p. 61.

44. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 231r-232v, letter of 27 August 1542.

45. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 432; see p. 1041.

46. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 247-49. Gonzaga in Naples was promptly informed of the contents of the letter (Bruto Amante, *Giulia Gonzaga contessa di Fondi e il movimento religioso femminile nel secolo XVI*, Zanichelli, Bologna 1896, pp. 434-35). On the affair, see G. Fragnito, Gli "*spirituali*" e la fuga, cited above, especially pp. 146 ff.

47. A. Luzio, *Vittoria Colonna*, cited above, p. 41; K. Benrath, *Bernardino Ochino*, cited above, p. 285; see A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 312 ff.

48. Ph. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy*, cited above, pp. 284 ff.

49. See above, section IV.2.

50. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 256-57.

51. Rinaldo Corso, *Dichiaratione fatta sopra la seconda parte delle Rime della divina Vittoria Collonna marchesana di Pescara*, Gian Battista de Phaelli, Bologna 1543, p. K3v; see also pp. B1r, K2v. Ochino's name was removed from the later edition of *Tutte le rime della illustrissima et eccellentissima signora Vittoria Colonna*, published in Venice in 1558; see Giovanna Romei, *Corso, Rinaldo*, in DBI, vol. XXIX, pp. 687-90.

52. Emidio Campi, *Michelangelo e Vittoria Colonna. Un dialogo artistico-teologico ispirato da Bernardino Ochino*, Claudiana, Turin 1994; see also *Vittoria Colonna Dichterin*, cited above; Monica Bianco and Vittoria Romani, *Vittoria Colonna e Michelangelo*, in *Vittoria Colonna e Michelangelo*, cited above, pp. 143-64; Alexander Nagel, *Michelangelo and the Reform* of Art, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000; Una Roman D'Elia, Drawing *Christ's Blood. Michelangelo, Vittoria Colonna, and the Aesthetics of Reform*, in Renaissance Quarterly, LIX (2006), pp. 90-129; Maria Forcellino, Michelangelo, *Vittoria Colonna* e gli "*spirituali*." Religiosità e vita artistica a Roma negli anni Quaranta, Viella, Rome 2009; Id., *Vittoria Colonna and Michelangelo: Drawings and* Paintings, in A. Brundin, T. Crivelli, and M. T. Sapegno, eds., *A Companion to Vittoria* Colonna, cited above, pp. 270-313; Massimo Firpo and Fabrizio Biferali, *Immagini ed eresie nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2016, pp. 288 ff.; Veronica

Copello, Il *dialogo poetico tra Michelangelo e Vittoria Colonna*, in Italian Studies, LXXII (2017), pp. 271-81.

53. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, p. 268.

54. Giorgio Vasari, Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori scultori et architettori nelle redazioni del *1550 e 1568*, text ed. Rosanna Bettarini, secular commentary ed. Paola Barocchi, 6 vols., S.P.E.S., Florence 1967-84, vol. VI, pp. 111-12.

55. Ascanio Condivi, *Vita di Michelagnolo Buonarroti*, ed. Giovanni Nencioni, with essays by Michael Hirst and Caroline Elam, S.P.E.S., Florence 1998, pp. 60-61.

56. MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 1915, f. 767r, *Sommario di una lettera di Trento di 20 d'agosto del '46*.

57. PM, vol. I, pp. 468-69; see p. 648: "I met the Marchioness of Pescara in Naples [in 1529]," Morone would later add, "and when I was made bishop she sent me some rochets and breviaries; some years later, after I had been made cardinal, I saw her in Rome, or perhaps earlier when passing through Viterbo, and I knew her to be very devoted - as she showed in spiritual matters - to Cardinal Pole."

58. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 432.

59. Ibid., p. 1033.

60. PM, vol. III, p. 556; see S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, p. 104. A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 64-67, rejects every heterodox reading of the documents analyzed here.

61. V. Colonna, Rime, cited above, p. 155 (no. 140); see also the following pages, which contain several sonnets (nos. 141-143) addressed to the Cardinal of England.

62. PM, vol. I, pp. 1015-17 and note 14.

63. Ibid.; on what follows, see also D. Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, cited above, pp. 213 ff.

64. PM, vol. I, pp. 1018-21 and notes 35, 48.

65. Ibid., p. 1022.

66. Ibid., pp. 1023-24.

67. Ibid., p. 1025 and note 90. 68. Benedetto da Mantua, *Il Beneficio di Cristo*, cited above, p. 431.

69. M. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, pp. 129-31.

70. V. Colonna, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 249-52.

71. Ibid., pp. 231-35.

72. The text of this letter and Pole's enclosures is published in PM, vol. I, pp. 1026 ff., note 96.

73. Ibid., p. 1032, letter of 7 July 1543.

74. Ibid., pp. 1026-31, letter of May-June 1543; see S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, p. 150. See also Colonna's letters "to the prioress and nuns of Santa Caterina in Viterbo" and to Vincenzo Parpaglia, published by P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 264-65.

75. PM, vol. I, p. 1035, note 144.

76. "Our Lord knows that I have no excessive desire to speak with Your Lordship for any other reason than that I see in him an ordering of the spirit that only the spirit can perceive, and he always draws me so far upward into that breadth of light that he does not let me dwell too much on my own wretchedness. Rather, with such lofty and substantial thoughts he shows me the greatness above and our own baseness and nothingness, so that, seeing ourselves and all created things serve us toward this end, we must find ourselves in him alone who is all things" (ibid., pp. 134-35). This is probably one of the texts preserved in a manuscript in the Biblioteca Valentiniana in Camerino, partly published by B. Fontana, *Nuovi documenti vaticani*, cited above, pp. 611 ff.

77. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 273r-274v: “Monsignor of Otranto returned the quire as promised,” Priuli concluded; see PM, vol. I, p. 422 and note 109.

78. PM, vol. I, p. 81.

79. The Marchioness of Pescara described him in these terms in a letter sent to Pole in 1544 (ibid., vol. III, p. 551; see S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, p. 98).

80. In a letter to Morone of 11 June 1544, Priuli alluded to the cardinal’s desire “to receive frequent news of the good health of Monsignor [Pole] and the lady marchioness” (OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 287r-289v). A letter from the Venetian patrician to Beccadelli, dated Rome, 17 May 1544, shows that Filippo Gheri, Morone’s secretary, was also corresponding with Colonna at that time (ibid., ff. 281r-284v).

81. PM, vol. I, pp. 1037-39 and note 190.

82. Ibid., pp. 1040-41.

83. *Lettere inedite di Vittoria Colonna e Benedetto Varchi*, ed. Abd-el Kader Salza, in *Nozze Mariani-Achiardi*, Tip. pei minori corrigendi, Florence 1898, pp. 55-56 (Rome, 2 September 1544); see also pp. 6-7, the marchioness’s letter to Vincenzo Parpaglia of 17 January 1545, in which she asked that “two things be excluded from our letters: one is joking about the service I owe Monsignor; the other, worldly affairs.”

84. PM, vol. I, pp. 1042-43.

85. “I believe that, in speaking there of Cardinal Pole” - this would be Morone’s comment on the first part of the passage just quoted - “[Colonna] means that he would have been a good instrument for bringing Germany and the heretics back to the Church” (ibid., p. 651).

86. Ibid., pp. 651-52.

87. Ibid., pp. 1046-47; see S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 165-66.

88. To clarify the meaning of this ambiguous passage, see the hypothesis suggested by D. Fenlon, *Heresy and Obedience*, cited above, pp. 213 ff.; see also what *Carlo Gualteruzzi*, Bembo’s secretary, wrote on 12 May 1545 to Ludovico Beccadelli, then at Trent with Pole: “These patrons of ours here [Bembo and Cervini] love you both as usual, more every day, the more you give them occasion each day to love you still more through your good works; but do not accuse me to Signor Priuli for saying this” (Carlo Dionisotti, *Monumenti Beccadelli*, in *Miscellanea Pio Paschini. Studi di storia ecclesiastica*, 2 vols., Lateranum, Rome 1959, vol. II, pp. 251-68, especially p. 257); or what Bernardino Maffei communicated to Colonna on 12 February 1546 to induce her to persuade Pole’s friend to accept the office of secretary to the council, since this might be precisely the path found by “His Divine Majesty to join Priuli’s faith with works, so that it might not die” (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 423).

89. “I believe she meant, to cause Priuli greater pain, since he teased her about the anguish she felt at the cardinal’s absence, that he should be obliged to remain away for at least a year; but not in Bologna, which was too pleasant a place, rather in Germany, where one suffers greatly, and in addition that he should be obliged to speak Pelagianly among Lutherans” (PM, vol. I, pp. 649-50).

90. Bruto Amante, *La tomba di Vittoria Colonna e i testamenti finora inediti della poetessa*, Nicola Zanichelli, Bologna 1896, pp. 52, 62.

91. PM, vol. I, pp. 19-25.

92. Ibid., pp. 591-92 and note 30.

93. S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 25 ff., and Gigliola Fragnito’s review of this volume in Benedictina, XXXVII (1990), pp. 157-72.

94. See S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 127-30.

95. PM, vol. III, pp. 852-53.

96. See above, section II.5.

97. PM, vol. II, pp. 21-31.

98. “I was glad to learn that Messer Filippo is with the Most Reverend Morone,” Priuli wrote to Beccadelli on 13 September 1542, three weeks after Contarini’s death (OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 247r-248v); by 16 October Priuli was already calling him “secretary to the Most Reverend Morone” (ibid., ff. 258r-259v; see CT, vol. I, pp. 243, 306). Gheri was the brother of Cosimo, bishop of Fano, the victim of a brutal rape committed by Pier Luigi Farnese in 1537; see Antonella Giusti, *Gheri (Ghieri, Gieri), Cosimo*, in DBI, vol. LIII, pp. 645-49; Id., *Gheri (Ghieri, Geri), Filippo*, ibid., pp. 449-53; Samuele Giombi, *Cosimo Gheri (1513-1537): un ecclesiastico pretridentino vescovo di Fano*, in Studia picena, LXX (2005), pp. 103-58. Entrusted to Beccadelli by his brother’s last wishes, the young Filippo entered Contarini’s cardinal household and followed him to Regensburg in 1541, before passing into Morone’s service, where he would remain his most faithful collaborator until his death in Genoa in 1575, still in his patron’s retinue. Only during the Bologna legation did the man whom Carnesecchi would call Morone’s “spirit and soul” leave him for a time, when Beccadelli summoned him in August 1546 to collaborate in the service of Cardinal Ranuccio Farnese. Gheri’s trajectory offers a fragment of the fluid relations that existed in these years between the *spirituali* and the papal family. They are neatly summarized in a letter of Morone from October 1542, in which he advised Beccadelli to accept appointment as tutor to Ranuccio Farnese, because in this way “you would be the master, and by serving him you would come to serve the whole Farnese house; [...] and after some time the pope, who is generous to those who serve his nephews, would not fail to raise and favor you” (Gigliola Fragnito, In *museo e in villa. Saggi sul Rinascimento perduto*, Arsenale, Venice 1988, p. 104). On 5 November 1554 the Milanese cardinal would recommend Filippo Gheri to Ercole Gonzaga as successor to the diocese of Fano (see below, section XVI.4). The see would instead pass to Ippolito Capilupi in 1560, while Gheri was appointed bishop of Ischia in 1559.

99. G. Fragnito, Gli “*spirituali*” e la fuga, cited above, p. 172.

100. See below, section VII.1.

101. PM, vol. III, pp. 539-40.

102. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 429-32.

103. P. Simoncelli, *Pietro Bembo*, cited above; M. Firpo, *Pietro Bembo cardinale*, in Id., *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 159-71.

104. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 251.

105. FiAS, *Carte del cardinal di Ravenna*, 4, ff. 287r-287v.

106. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 308; P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 72, 92. On him, see Gerhard Rill, *Bertano, Pietro*, in DBI, vol. IX, pp. 467-71; PM, vol. I, p. 35, note 7.

107. G. Alonge, *Condottiero, cardinale, eretico. Federico Fregoso*, cited above, pp. 285 ff.

108. Matteo Al Kalak, *I vescovi riformatori. Nuove prospettive per una categoria antica*, in Lucia Felici, ed., *Ripensare la Riforma protestante. Nuove prospettive degli studi* italiani, Claudiana, Turin 2015, pp. 107-21.

109. Melquíades Andrés Martín, *Implicaciones señoriales del alumbradismo castellano en torno a 1525*, in Marta Cristina Carbonell and Adolfo Vázquez Sotelo, eds., Homenaje *al profesor Antonio Vilanova*, Universidad de Barcelona, Barcelona 1989, pp. 13-30.

110. M. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, pp. 139 ff.

111. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, pp. 296, 344. On the involvement of the Italian aristocracies in religious dissent, see F. Gui, *L’attesa del concilio*, cited above; Susanna Peyronel Rambaldi, *Élites nobiliari in Italia di fronte alla Riforma protestante*, in Stefano Levati and Marco Meriggi, eds., *Con la ragione e col cuore. Studi dedicati a Carlo Capra*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2008, pp. 89-116; and especially Id., *Una gentildonna irrequieta*, cited above.

112. See below, section XII.3.

113. See below, section XII.2.

114. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above.

115. Aldo Stella, *La lettera del cardinale Contarini sulla predestinazione*, in Rivista di storia *della Chiesa* in Italia, XV (1961), pp. 411-41, especially p. 416, note 22; see E. G. Gleason, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, p. 169.

116. MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 1906, ff. 425v, 430r.

117. Ibid., ff. 458v-459r.

118. On what follows, see also F. Gui, *L'attesa del concilio*, cited above, pp. 70 ff., 177 ff.; Id., *Il papato e i Colonna al tempo di Filippo II*, in Bruno Anatra and Francesco Manconi, eds., *Sardegna, Spagna e Stati italiani nell'età di Filippo II*, AM&D, Cagliari 1999, pp. 9-77; Massimo Firpo, *Politica imperiale e vita religiosa in Italia nell'età di Carlo V*, now in Id., "Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede," cited above, pp. 159-64.

119. See above, section II.5.

120. See his letter to the papal secretary Ambrogio Recalcati (Marino, 7 May 1542), published by P. Tacchi Venturi, Storia della Compagnia di Gesù, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 117. "From what I have understood," Carnesecchi would later say of Ascanio Colonna, "he held many opinions concerning religion that were not Catholic, but precisely what they were I do not know. I do know that when Fra Bernardino was in Italy, that lord openly professed himself his friend, as did the marchioness, his sister" (*Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 512).

121. PM, vol. I, pp. 155 ff.; see also pp. 183-84.

122. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, pp. 250-52; see *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1103.

123. On what follows, see also Massimo Firpo, *Gli affreschi di Pontormo a San Lorenzo. Eresia, politica e cultura nella Firenze di Cosimo I*, Einaudi, Turin 1997. The essays by Chrysa Damianaki add nothing to it except an erroneous Lutheran interpretation of those frescoes: *Pontormo's Lost Frescoes in San Lorenzo, Florence. A Reappraisal of their Religious Content*, in Abigail Brundin and Matthew Treherne, eds., *Forms of Faith in Sixteenth-Century Italy*, Ashgate, Aldershot 2009, pp. 77-118; Id., La *storiografia storico-artistica e il dibattito cinquecentesco sulle immagini sacre nella Riforma italiana ed europea: risultati ed esiti (2004-2014), con due saggi su Jacopo* Pontormo, in L. Felici, ed., *Ripensare la Riforma protestante*, cited above, pp. 213-38, especially pp. 222 ff.

124. Massimo Firpo, *Baccio Bandinelli e il coro di Santa Maria del Fiore*, in Rinascimento, LIV (2015), pp. 85-132, in Id., *Tra politica e religione. Nuovi studi su immagini e storia nel '500*, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa 2016, pp. 151-201.

125. G. Fragnito, *Evangelismo e intransigenti*, cited above; E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 172, 183, 192, 249.

126. Marco Iacovella, Dall'"*Alfabeto cristiano*" al "Beneficio di Cristo," in Rivista storica italiana, CXXVIII (2016), pp. 177-215, especially pp. 197 ff.

127. J. de Valdés, *Alfabeto cristiano* (Prosperi ed.), cited above, p. 24.

128. [P. P. Vergerio], *Il catalogo de' libri*, cited above, pp. giiiiv ff.

129. M. Flaminio, Meditationi, cited above, pp. 28 ff.

130. Jesús Martínez de Bujanda, ed., *Index des livres interdits*, 12 vols., Centre d'études de la Renaissance de l'Université de Sherbrooke-Droz, Sherbrooke, Quebec-Geneva 1984-2016, vol. III, p. 392.

131. Silvano Cavazza, *Libri in volgare e propaganda eterodossa: Venezia 1543-1547*, in *Libri, idee e sentimenti religiosi nel Cinquecento italiano*, Panini, Modena 1987, pp. 9-27; see also Gabriella Zarri, *Note su diffusione e circolazione di testi devoti (1520*-1550), ibid., pp. 131-54, especially p. 136.

132. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. IV-V.

133. M. Firpo, *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 195 ff.

134. See above, chapter IV, note 11.

135. See above, section VI.2.

136. See below, section VII.1.

137. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 263r-265v.

138. CT, vol. IV, pp. 308, 319 and note 7, 320 and note 2; on what follows, see also Pastor, vol. V, pp. 454 ff.; Jedin, vol. I, pp. 499 ff.

139. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. XXI.

140. CT, vol. IV, pp. 304-5. Morone also wrote to Modena about that conversation, informing Canon Gaspare dal Lino - on whom see ibid., p. 872, note 72 - as Lancillotti reports, vol. VIII, p. XIV.

141. CT, vol. IV, pp. 328, note 30, 329 and note 2, 330; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 294 ff.

142. CT, vol. IV, pp. 334-40; see pp. 343-44.

143. Ibid., pp. 345-48; on what follows, see also Pastor, vol. V, pp. 461 ff.; Jedin, vol. I, pp. 538-40.

144. PM, vol. II, p. 436.

145. Ibid., vol. I, p. 230.

146. Ibid., pp. 422-23.

147. CT, vol. IV, p. 348 (italics added).

148. Ibid., pp. 348-51.

149. Ibid., pp. 352-56; see NB1, vol. VII, p. 378.

150. CT, vol. IV, p. 356, note 3.

151. PM, vol. II, pp. 431-33; see also pp. 449-50.

152. Ibid., pp. 451-52.

153. Ibid., p. 465.

154. Ibid., pp. 453-59.

155. Ibid., vol. II, p. 460.

156. P. Bembo, Lettere, cited above, p. 499.

157. On what follows, see also Massimo Firpo, *L'eresia del vescovo: il governo pastorale di Vittore Soranzo a Bergamo (1544-1550)*, in Philip Benedict, Silvana Seidel Menchi, and Alain Tallon, eds., *La Réforme en France et en Italie*, École française de Rome, Rome 2007, pp. 161-81, later in Id., *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 173-93. For a more detailed analysis, see M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 215 ff.

158. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, p. 411.

159. Ibid., p. 324.

160. Ibid., pp. 108-9.

161. Ibid., pp. 239-40, 427.

162. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 629-30.

163. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 569.

164. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 647.

165. Ibid., pp. 57-58; see p. 34.

166. Davide Romano, *Un testo di propaganda eterodossa nell'Italia del Cinquecento: il* "Trattato di santo Atanasio della semplice e pura Chiesa d'Iddio," in Bollettino della Società di studi valdesi, no. 201 (2007), pp. 3-31.

167. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, pp. 176-77.

168. Ibid., pp. 396, 424.

169. Ibid., pp. 23-24, 73; see also pp. 70-71.

170. Ibid., pp. 26-28.

171. Ibid., pp. 34-36, 205, 287-89; see p. 361.

172. Ibid., pp. 67-68; see pp. 289-90.

173. Ibid., pp. 71, 127.

174. Ibid., pp. 298, 300.

175. Ibid., pp. 82, 84, 86-87, 121, 125-26.

176. M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 282 ff.

VII. "Having Become a Lutheran, He Must Have Wished to Make All His People the Same"

1. J. de Valdés, *Il dialogo della dottrina cristiana*, cited above, p. 184.

2. PM, vol. I, p. 594.

3. See the admittedly debatable study by Emily Michelson, *The Pulpit and the Press in Reformation Italy*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA-London 2013.

4. See above, section III.2.

5. PM, vol. I, p. 655.

6. Ibid., pp. 433-34. Later, when the inquisitors asked whether anyone had told him that Fra Bernardo understood the article of justification well and would therefore instruct the faithful properly, Morone would answer - his face contracted with surprise and embarrassment - that he had been presented to him as "a good Christian, who had a good spirit and who would satisfy that people and perform his duty" (ibid., pp. 496-98).

7. Ibid., p. 1022.

8. Ibid., p. 77.

9. Ibid., p. 180.

10. Ibid., pp. 150, 596-97.

11. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, pp. XVII, XX.

12. PM, vol. II, p. 456.

13. See also the statements of Morone and Don Domenico Morando (ibid., vol. I, pp. 781-82, 1269-71).

14. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 437-38.

15. This is how Alessandro Milani, one of the Academy's members who had by then returned to Catholic orthodoxy, would report it in 1560 (ibid., p. 831).

16. Ibid., pp. 438-39.

17. Ibid., pp. 836, 850-51; see also the deposition of Egidio Foscarari, ibid., pp. 983-84.

18. The Jesuit Alfonso Salmerón, for example, would say that he had "heard from several Catholic persons that while His Most Reverend Lordship was in Trent, [...] he had written to Modena that it should be preached from the pulpit that men should place their trust not in works but in the blood of Christ alone"

(ibid., vol. I, p. 196). Giovan Battista Scotti would likewise report that he had regarded as evidence of Morone's religious shift the fact that at the end of Lent in 1543 he had "written to his vicar in Modena that he should command all his parish priests, at Easter, to make the people understand in their parishes that they were justified solely through the blood of Christ" (ibid., p. 236).

19. Ibid., pp. 83-84, 91, 94-95, 97-100, 655-58, 666-69, 709.

20. See below, section XIII.1.

21. PM, vol. II, p. 159.

22. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 835-36. It was no accident that Morone wished to include among the defensive documents submitted to the tribunal an extract from the chapter on *confessio*n in the *Concilium coloniense* (ibid., vol. II, pp. 733 ff.).

23. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 253 ff.; M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 291-92.

24. PM, vol. I, pp. 435-36; see vol. II, p. 158.

25. Ibid., vol. I, p. 1277.

26. Ibid., p. 1026. 27. Ibid., pp. 90, 92-93, 656-57, 670.

28. Ibid., pp. 89, 656-58, 665-66, 1139, 1274.

29. See above, section V.4.

30. PM, vol. I, p. 17; see pp. 241, 695.

31. Ibid., pp. 101-2, 672, 1257-59, 1273-80.

32. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. XLIII.

33. PM, vol. I, p. 232; see pp. 234-35. This information would also be confirmed to the inquisitors by Salmerón (ibid., p. 636) and by Scotti, according to whom, on Morone's return from Trent, those "Lutherans of Modena" had dared to present themselves openly for what they were and to "be at ease with him, whereas before they would not have dared to come before him," and Morone "had made his apologies to them and almost asked their pardon for the trouble he had previously caused them" (ibid., pp. 232 ff.). The cardinal would seek to defend himself by claiming that he had "heard it said that these members of the sect or Academy, as they called it, often said, in order to promote their own cause, that not only I but many good Catholics and upright men agreed with them" (ibid., pp. 693-94). It is hardly surprising that such a sensational accusation was later turned into a specific article of indictment (ibid., p. 547).

34. Ibid., pp. 42, 670; vol. II, p. 1343.

35. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 8-15, 236; see pp. 692-93, 705-6. The Holy Office would formulate no fewer than three charges on the basis of these pastoral instructions issued by Morone (ibid., pp. 543-44).

36. Ibid., pp. 697-98; see p. 695.

37. See above, sections X.1 and IV.1.

38. See above, section V.4.

39. PM, vol. I, p. 696.

40. On this famous heterodox booklet and its considerable success in Italy, see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Dai Paesi Bassi all'Italia*, cited above.

41. PM, vol. I, pp. 502-4, 686-87.

42. Ibid., p. 14; see pp. 232-33, 242-43, 291, 684-86.

43. Ibid., pp. 694-95.

44. Ibid., p. 818.

45. Ibid., pp. 427-28, 626; vol. II, p. 105.

46. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 428-33.

47. See above, section I.3.

48. PM, vol. I, pp. 288-90; vol. II, p. 456.

49. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 707-8.

50. Ibid., p. 181.

51. The pages A. P. Robinson devotes in *The Career*, cited above, pp. 67 ff., to Morone's diocesan government after his encounter with Pole and Flaminio at Trent are embarrassed and evasive.

52. PM, vol. I, p. 575.

53. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 460-62.

54. Guido Mongini, "Ad Christi similitudinem." Ignazio di Loyola e i primi gesuiti tra *eresia e ortodossia*, Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria 2011; Id., *Maschere dell'identità.* Alle origini della Compagnia di Gesù, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2016; Stefania Pastore, *Unwise Paths. Ignatius Loyola and the Years of Alcalá de Henares*, in Robert Aleksander Maryks, ed., *A Companion to Ignatius of Loyola. Life, Writings, Spirituality, Influence*, Brill, Leiden 2014, pp. 25-44.

55. PM, vol. I, pp. 84-86 (where Bartoli nevertheless speaks of "a venerable priest" who "resisted him and refused to go there"), p. 658.

56. Ibid., p. 438.

57. Ibid., pp. 834-35, 853-54; see p. 877; vol. II, pp. 950-51.

58. Ibid., pp. 816, 1076, 1088; see vol. I, p. 118.

59. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 165-66; see p. 187.

60. On what follows, see also ibid., vol. I, pp. 190-202, 574-86, Salmerón's own depositions; but see also ibid., pp. 14-15. Morone's words would later become a specific article of accusation against him (ibid., p. 544).

61. Ibid., p. 439.

62. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 163-64. In 1560 Ludovico Simonetta, soon to become a cardinal, would declare that he had learned from Morone "that Salmerón preached and magnified works. His Most Reverend Lordship urged him also to mention grace, so that those who listened might not fall into the error of Pelagius. This displeased Salmerón, who said that he wished to preach in his own way" (ibid., pp. 799-800).

63. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 194-95; see pp. 438-39; vol. II, pp. 1366-67.

64. Ibid., pp. 1621-22.

65. Ibid., vol. I, p. 576.

66. Ibid., p. 593.

67. Ibid., pp. 197, 199, 201-2, 578-79.

68. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. LIV.

69. Ibid., p. XLVI; see G. Fragnito, *Il cardinale Gregorio Cortese*, cited above, pp. 99-100.

70. NB1, vol. VII, p. 422.

71. The sources used by Marta Pasquali and Marina Ferretti, *Cronotassi critica dei legati, vicelegati e governatori di Bologna dal secolo XVI al XVII*, in Atti e memorie della R. Deputazione di storia patria per le provincie di Romagna, new series, XXIII (1972), pp. 117-302, especially pp. 133-34, fluctuate between 2 and 7 April; the brief of appointment is dated 14 April (PM, vol. II, pp. 480-82).

72. Morone's letters to the cathedral chapter, sent from Rome on 18 and 26 January and 29 March 1544, 28 February 1549, and from Bologna on 28 May and 7 December 1544, 3 February 1545, and 23 October

1547 (MoAC, Capitolo, 109), deal chiefly with minor administrative matters - tithes and exemptions - and appointments to offices, sometimes to overturn the canons' choices.

73. See below, section VIII.3.

74. PM, vol. II, pp. 1071-73; see *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1223.

75. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, pp. 619-20.

76. In his first examination on 25 June 1557, when questioned on this point, Morone would evasively answer that he did not remember Soranzo having "recommended any person" to him (PM, vol. I, p. 484).

77. Ibid., pp. 15-16, 233, 689. The reference is to Soranzo's letter to Scotti of 19 April 1544, published in *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, pp. 619-20; see also pp. 614, 621-22, 624, 628, 630.

78. PM, vol. I, pp. 382-87, 679-80.

79. Ibid., p. 682; on him, see ibid., p. 22, note 44.

80. The cardinal would say that he did not remember any recommendation from Soranzo (ibid., p. 485; see p. 496).

81. Ibid., p. 197; see vol. II, pp. 466-67.

82. Ibid., pp. 15, 238-41.

83. The Latin verses in which Flaminio mentions Morone probably date from these same years (M. Flaminio, Carmina, cited above, pp. 171, 179).

84. PM, vol. I, pp. 86-88, 103-4, 290, 671. Morone would naturally deny ever having uttered such words and, in any case, deny that he had "ever understood a naked Christ without all the sacraments and all the other institutions of the Church" (ibid., p. 520).

85. Ibid., p. 275; these accusations would become specific charges against Morone (ibid., pp. 545-46).

86. Ibid., p. 358.

87. Ibid., p. 678.

88. Ibid., pp. 330-31, 334-38, 539-40, 675-76; vol. II, pp. 107-9, 886, 1199-1200, 1204-5; see also pp. 1353-54. In his *confessio* Morone would admit that he might have uttered some unfortunate words about saints and relics, "as one says, *inter pocula et ratione disputandi et colloquendi* [over wine, in the course of discussion and conversation]. [...] But if I said anything bad, I wish it to be regarded as unsaid, because it will have arisen from no evil root, but either from ignorance and inadvertence, or to induce others to speak, or from contention after dinner and as entertainment, as is customary: et *in multiloquio non deest peccatum* [in much speaking there is no lack of sin]" (ibid., p. 461).

89. Ibid., pp. 336, 357-58, 677-78, 680-81.

90. Ibid., pp. 331, 337, 680.

91. See M. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, pp. 129-31.

92. PM, vol. I, pp. 462, 482.

93. Ibid., vol. II, p. 428.

94. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 1108, 1137.

95. Ibid., p. 68.

96. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. LXXXIV.

97. PM, vol. I, p. 39; see p. 276.

98. On the affair, in addition to the trial and Pergola's own depositions published in PM, vol. I, pp. 318-92, 674-83, see the careful reconstruction by Cesare Bianco, Bartolomeo *della Pergola e la sua predicazione eterodossa a Modena nel 1544*, in Bollettino della Società di studi valdesi, no. 151 (1982), pp. 3-49, especially pp. 3-4; Id., *La comunità di* "fratelli," cited above; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited

above, pp. 225-26, 263; G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 124, 149-51; M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, pp. 50-51.

99. MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Rettori dello Stato. Modena*, 58; see ibid., 59, his letters of 13 and 15 June.

100. PM, vol. II, p. 470.

101. Ibid., p. 474; see vol. I, p. 1249.

102. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 475-76.

103. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. LXIV.

104. PM, vol. II, p. 478.

105. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, pp. LXI-LXIV, LXXVII, LXXXIV.

106. PM, vol. I, p. 681.

107. Ibid., p. 104; see p. 671.

108. See ibid., vol. II, pp. 483-84, the extract from a letter of Morone to Sigibaldi of 11 May 1544.

109. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1303.

110. Ibid., pp. 1355-56.

111. Ibid., p. 486.

112. This title appears in the address of a letter sent to him by Gualteruzzi on 16 August (OBL, MS Ital., C. 24, ff. 52r-53v).

113. Ibid., ff. 281r-284v; see also ibid., ff. 285r-286v, Priuli's contemporary letter to Morone.

114. PM, vol. I, pp. 337-41, 681. The text of Beccadelli's Addictiones is published ibid., p. 340, note 46.

115. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 290r-291v; see also ibid., ff. 292r-293v, the letter of 23 June.

116. C. Bianco, *Bartolomeo della Pergola*, cited above, p. 12 and note 51.

117. PM, vol. II, pp. 488-90.

118. Published ibid., pp. 492-534; see also vol. I, pp. 344 ff.; C. Bianco, *Bartolomeo della Pergola*, cited above, pp. 28 ff.

119. PM, vol. I, p. 681.

120. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. LXXXIV; C. Bianco, *Bartolomeo della Pergola*, cited above, pp. 26-27.

121. PM, vol. II, pp. 490, 535-41.

122. Alessandro Tassoni, Cronaca, in *Cronache modenesi di Alessandro Tassoni, di Giovanni da Bazzano e di Bonifazio Morano*, in Monumenti di storia patria delle provincie modenesi. Serie delle cronache, vol. XV, Società tipografica, Modena 1888, p. 335.

123. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. LXXXV.

124. Ibid., pp. LXXXV-LXXXVI; see also p. LXXXVIII.

125. PM, vol. I, p. 467; see also p. 623; vol. II, pp. 171-73.

126. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 292r-292v.

127. PM, vol. I, pp. 338-39.

128. See below, sections X.1 and XII.2.

129. PM, vol. I, pp. 239-41, 322-24, 327, 333, 387-88.

130. Ibid., pp. 331-32, 341-42, 683.

131. CT, vol. X, p. 229.

132. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, pp. 208, 315-16; see also CT, vol. I, pp. 870-71.

133. Samuele Giombi, *Un ecclesiastico tridentino al governo diocesano. Marcello II Cervini (1501-1555) e la riforma della Chiesa fra centro e periferia*, Edizioni di Studia picena, Ancona 2010, pp. 243 ff., 357 ff.; Chiara Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini (1501-1555). Riforma della Chiesa, concilio, Inquisizione*, il Mulino, Bologna 2010, pp. 351, 366-67.

134. Girolamo Muzio, *Lettere catholiche*, Giovanni Andrea Valvassori detto Guadagnino, Venice 1571, pp. 178 ff.

135. ACDF, *Stanza storica*, Decreta, vol. I, f. 192r; vol. II, ff. 50v, 52v, 55r, 119v.

136. CT, vol. VIII, pp. 565-66; see C. Bianco, *Bartolomeo della Pergola*, cited above, pp. 44-49.

137. PM, vol. I, p. 779. The episode was reported by Scipione Bongalli and finds no confirmation in Giacomelli's depositions (ibid., pp. 755-67, 787-90).

138. Ibid., p. 778.

139. Ibid., pp. 550-51.

140. Ibid., p. 306; see also pp. 789 ff.

141. Ibid., pp. 641-42; see Giorgio Caravale, *Sulle tracce dell'eresia. Ambrogio Catarino Politi (1484-1553)*, Olschki, Florence 2007, pp. 140-42. As late as March 1560, Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla would recall that in Modena at that time there was much discussion of the fact that Morone and his collaborators disfavored Catholic preachers and favored heterodox ones, and that the city was "muy dañada" - badly corrupted (PM, vol. III, p. 586; see José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, *Contarini, Pole, Morone, denunciados por el cardenal Francisco de Mendoza (1560). Un documento del proceso Carranza*, in Id., Fray *Bartolomé Carranza y el cardenal Pole. Un navarro en la restauración católica de Inglaterra (1554-1558)*, Diputación Foral de Navarra, Institución Príncipe de Viana, Pamplona 1977, pp. 285-302, especially p. 298).

142. On what follows, see also PM, vol. I, pp. 284-85, note 6; Albano Biondi, *Streghe ed eretici nei domini estensi all'epoca dell'Ariosto*, in *Il Rinascimento nelle corti padane. Società e cultura*, De Donato, Bari 1977, pp. 165-99, now in Id., *Umanisti, eretici, streghe*, cited above, pp. 67-97, especially pp. 90-91.

143. It is enough to cite Eleonora Belligni, *Renata di Francia (1510-1575). Un'eresia di corte*, Utet, Turin 2011.

144. PM, vol. II, pp. 552-57.

145. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. 16; see PM, vol. I, p. 284, note 6. According to Giovan Battista Molza, Sigibaldi took the ducal proclamation as his cue to "issue edicts forbidding the possession of heretical books and requiring denunciation whenever anyone was heard speaking about the faith" (ibid., vol. II, pp. 856-57).

146. PM, vol. I, pp. 124-28 and notes 16 and 21.

147. See above, section VI.4.

148. PM, vol. II, pp. 580-81; see M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 356-57.

149. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 275.

150. PM, vol. II, pp. 485-86 and note 1.

151. See above, section VI.1.

152. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 271r-274v; see two letters from Ricciulli to Morone, both dated 10 May 1544 (ibid., ff. 275r-276v, 277r-280v), which may never have reached their destination (ibid., ff. 287r-289v).

153. See above, section V.1.

154. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, pp. 622-23; PM, vol. I, p. 1063. On Ricciulli, who was soon to return to the ranks of Catholic orthodoxy, see ibid., note 41; L. Addante, *Valentino Gentile*, cited above, pp. 96 ff. A

few years later the Bolognese heterodox would not fail to inform the inquisitors of Soranzo's friendship "with the minister general of the Minims in 1544 because he was a Lutheran, praising him as pious and religious, that is, Lutheran" (*Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 614; see also *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 871, 877-78, 926-27).

155. On the spread of Valdesianism in Calabria, see L. Addante, *Valentino Gentile*, cited above, pp. 45 ff.

156. OBL, MS Ital., C. 25, ff. 287r-289v.

157. Ibid., ff. 292r-293v.

158. PM, vol. II, p. 167.

159. Egidio Foscarari would call him a man of the greatest religious zeal (ibid., p. 991).

160. See ibid., vol. I, p. 713.

161. A. Prosperi, *Tra evangelismo e Controriforma*, cited above, p. 242, note 159.

162. On him, and on what follows, see PM, vol. I, pp. 26-29, especially p. 37, note.

163. See above, section IV.2.

164. PM, vol. I, pp. 720-22.

165. Ibid., p. 122; see p. 713.

166. Ibid., pp. 30-31, 724-25.

167. Ibid., pp. 130, 713-14.

168. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, pp. 84-85; see p. LXVI; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 172.

169. PM, vol. II, p. 951.

170. See above, section III.5.

171. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, pp. 155, 185.

172. PM, vol. I, p. 27.

173. Ibid., p. 412; see vol. II, pp. 571, 720.

174. Ibid., vol. II, p. 855; see pp. 827-28.

175. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 26 ff., 120 ff., 712 ff.

176. Ibid., pp. 28-29, 716.

177. Ibid., pp. 122-29.

178. Ibid., pp. 132-35, 716-17, 726.

179. Ibid., p. 717.

180. See above, section II.2.

181. PM, vol. I, p. 719; see vol. II, p. 827.

182. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 564-65; see p. 569.

183. Ibid., pp. 546-47.

184. Lancillotti, vol. VIII, p. CIX; vol. IX, p. CIX; A. Tassoni, Cronaca, cited above, p. 335; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 226.

185. See Sigibaldi's letter of 13 December (PM, vol. II, pp. 572-73; see also pp. 574-77, 582-83).

186. MnAS, *Archivio Gonzaga*, 1915; copy in MoAC, Capitolo, 109.

187. Lancillotti, vol. IX, p. 54.

188. Ibid., pp. 210, 212, 217-18, 239, 270; see PM, vol. II, pp. 582-83.

189. Lancillotti, vol. X, pp. 27, 29; see also pp. 52, 56-57.

190. Ibid., pp. 58-59, 62-63; see PM, vol. I, p. 619, note 11.

191. PM, vol. II, pp. 622-23, 625.

192. Ibid., pp. 619-21, 627-28.

VIII. "He Found the Way to Punish the Wicked and the Gluttons": The Legation of Bologna

1. See above, section I.3.

2. PM, vol. II, p. 1283.

3. Ibid., p. 1277.

4. MiAS, Autografi, 45, fasc. *Giovanni Moroni*, letters of 30 November and 11 December 1530, 4 and 11 January and 3 February 1531.

5. See above, section IV.1. 6. Guilelmus van Gulik and Conradus Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii et recentioris* aevi, vol. III, sumptibus et typis librariae regensbergianae, Monasterii 1910; see also Paul III's brief to him of 13 April (PM, vol. II, pp. 480-82).

7. PM, vol. II, p. 1249, note 6.

8. Iacopo Sadoleto, *Epistolarum libri sexdecim*, apud haeredes Sebastiani Gryphii, Lugduni 1560, pp. 579-81.

9. OBL, MS Ital., C. 24, f. 51rv.

10. Ibid., C. 25, ff. 277r-280v.

11. PrBP, MS Palatino, 1020/1. Six days later he informed him that he had sent a trusted man to Bologna "to make provision for the needs of the household" (ibid.).

12. PM, vol. II, p. 1457; for the date of the entry, see ibid., p. 1248, note 6. Giacomo Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, ed. Armando Antonelli and Riccardo Pedrini, Costa, Bologna 1998, p. 127, gives the sixth.

13. BoBA, MS B.1089, p. 220, which incorrectly dates the event to 11 March.

14. As did Del Monte, Morone's successor (see Angelo Massarelli's letter to Marcello Cervini of 18 July 1548, in CT, vol. XI, p. 446).

15. PM, vol. II, p. 1310; see p. 1316.

16. On what follows, see also Pastor, vol. V, pp. 469 ff.

17. The bull of 30 July by which Paul III entrusted the peace legation to Morone, and the contemporary brief to Charles V, are in PM, vol. II, pp. 542-43, 545; see CT, vol. I, pp. 420-21; vol. IV, p. 363, note 4.

18. H. Laemmer, *Monumenta vaticana*, cited above, p. 428, who nevertheless dates the letter to 1542.

19. CT, vol. IV, p. 365, note 2; Pastor, vol. V, pp. 474 ff.; E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 136.

20. PM, vol. II, pp. 125-26. Paolo Giovio's allusive words to Alessandro Farnese on 18 September 1544 seem to refer to the conflict between the two papal legates: "Those two understand one another secretly and, as a joke, wage war in order to trap those who act in good faith" (P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. I, pp. 346-47).

21. *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa Carlo Gualteruzzi (1525-1549)*, ed. Ornella Moroni, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1986, p. 25.

22. CT, vol. I, p. 154.

23. Ibid., pp. 160, 164-65, 170, 172, 176-77, 181, 189, 194, 202, 214, 216, 220, 243, 255-56, 259, 266, note 2, 268-70, 273, 275, 278, 304, 306, 318, 328, 334, 339, 517, 654; vol. X, pp. 26-27, 209, 238-39.

24. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284.

25. Angela De Benedictis, *Repubblica per contratto. Bologna: una città europea nello Stato della Chiesa*, il Mulino, Bologna 1995.

26. Nicoletta Sarti, *Il paradigma politico degli statuti bolognesi nel basso Medioevo*, in Paola Maffei and Gian Maria Varanini, eds., "Honos alit artes." Studi per il *settantesimo compleanno di Mario Ascheri. Gli universi particolari. Città e territori dal Medioevo all'età moderna*, Firenze University Press, Florence 2014, pp. 133-40, especially p. 139.

27. Angela De Benedictis, *Repubblica per contratto. Una città (Bologna) nello stato* (pontificio), in Scienza & Politica, II (1990), no. 4, pp. 59-72.

28. On what follows, see also Umberto Mazzone, *Vita religiosa e vita civile tra centro e periferia: persone e istituzioni*, in *Storia di Bologna*, 4 vols., Bononia University Press, Bologna 2005-13, vol. III/2, *Cultura, istituzioni culturali, Chiesa e vita religiosa*, ed. Adriano Prosperi, pp. 1005-95; Id., *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime. La Chiesa a Bologna dal Quattrocento alla rivoluzione francese*, Libreria universitaria.it, Limena 2012, pp. 122 ff.

29. The son of Bosio II and Costanza Farnese, Paul III's natural daughter, he served as governor of Bologna in 1537-38.

30. Andrea Gardi, *Lineamenti della storia politica di Bologna: da Giulio II a Innocenzo X*, in *Storia di Bologna*, cited above, vol. III/1, *Istituzioni, forme del potere, economia e società*, ed. Adriano Prosperi, pp. 3-59, especially pp. 14-15.

31. Angela De Benedictis, *Il governo misto*, in *Storia di Bologna*, cited above, pp. 201-69, especially p. 219.

32. Gabriella Zarri, *Chiesa, religione, società (secoli XV-XVIII)*, ibid., pp. 885-1003, especially p. 948.

33. Umberto Mazzone, "Evellant vicia... aedificent virtutes": il cardinal legato come *elemento di disciplinamento nello Stato della Chiesa*, in Paolo Prodi, ed., *Disciplina dell'anima, disciplina del corpo e disciplina della società tra Medioevo ed età* moderna, il Mulino, Bologna 1994, pp. 691-731.

34. Guido Dall'Olio, *Gambaro, Pietro Andrea*, in DBI, vol. LII, pp. 82-83.

35. U. Mazzone, *Vita religiosa e vita civile*, cited above, p. 1026.

36. Ibid., p. 1036.

37. PM, vol. I, pp. 409-10.

38. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 772-73 and note 11, 1296, from which the quotation is taken. On Zambeccari, see Maria Celeste Cola, *Palazzo Valentini a Roma. La committenza Zambeccari, Boncompagni, Bonelli a Roma tra Cinquecento e Settecento*, Gangemi, Rome 2012, pp. 45-46.

39. PM, vol. II, p. 1389.

40. CT, vol. IV, p. 385; see vol. II, p. 8; Jedin, vol. II, pp. 55-56.

41. U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, p. 113.

42. Formerly governor of Fano in 1541, Mentuati remained in office at Bologna from May 1544 to September 1546, after which he became vice-legate at Avignon and nuncio in Poland from 1557 to 1560, where he died. On him, see PM, vol. I, p. 126, note 17.

43. Thus in the chronicle of Giovan Francesco Negri (BoBA, MS Gozzadini 135, unnumbered folios, under the year 1547).

44. A. De Benedictis, *Il governo misto*, cited above, p. 220; see U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, pp. 114-16, from which the quotation is taken.

45. U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, p. 117.

46. Ibid. The dispute was far from resolved after the end of Morone's Bologna legation. Although Julius III issued a brief in the city's favor in 1554, this aspect of the conflict between Bolognese autonomy and Roman centralism remained unsettled at the end of the seventeenth century.

47. PM, vol. II, p. 1438; see also p. 1291.

48. CT, vol. I, p. 654.

49. Ibid., pp. 700-1, note 3.

50. U. Mazzone, *Vita religiosa e vita civile*, cited above, p. 1027.

51. Ibid., p. 1028.

52. PM, vol. II, pp. 1286-87.

53. Ibid., p. 1288; see pp. 1287, 1330; and BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1538-1568, ff. 41r-48r, *Provvisione de la Colletta sopra il partire riscotere e pagare tutte le gravezze de contrà de Bologna* of 28 October 1547, and the related measures (ibid., f. 49r ff.).

54. A collection of the proclamations issued by Morone during the legation was included among his defensive documents (PM, vol. II, pp. 593-603; see BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563). ASV, *Segreteria di Stato. Legazioni. Bologna*, 178, ff. 243r-246v, preserves a Sommario dei bandi pubblicati dal Morone a Bologna, in which a cross in the margin distinguishes those concerning religion. As was customary (Francesco Di Donato, La *manutenzione delle norme nell'Antico regime. Ragioni pratiche e teorie giuspolitiche nelle società pre-rivoluzionarie*, in Studi parlamentari e di politica costituzionale, XLIII [2010], pp. 35-60), the proclamations were repeatedly reissued.

55. Mario Sbriccoli, *Storia del diritto penale e della giustizia. Scritti editi e inediti (1972*-2007), 2 vols., Giuffrè, Milan 2009, vol. I, pp. 18-20.

56. Giancarlo Angelozzi and Cesarina Casanova, *La giustizia criminale in una città di antico regime. Il tribunale del Torrone di Bologna (secc. XVI-XVII)*, Clueb, Bologna 2008; Ids., *La giustizia dei burocrati. La Restaurazione nella Bologna pontificia*, Museo del Risorgimento, Bologna 2010, pp. 3-4. For an overall historiographical view, see Maria Rosa Di Simone, *Introduzione. Orientamenti e prospettive nella storiografia sulla giustizia pontificia nell'età moderna*, in Id., ed., *La giustizia dello Stato pontificio in età moderna*, Viella, Rome 2011, pp. 11-28.

57. *Constitutiones servandae in foro reverendissimi et illustrissimi domini legati et reverendissimi vicelegati*, apud Anselmum Giacarellum, Bononiae 1548 (BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 83r-92v); see Tiziana Di Zio, *Il tribunale criminale di Bologna nel sec. XVI*, in Archivi per la storia, nos. 1-2 (1991), pp. 125-35.

58. Irene Fosi, *La giustizia del papa. Sudditi e tribunali nello Stato pontificio in età* moderna, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2007, pp. 12 ff.

59. PM, vol. II, p. 1288, note 83.

60. CT, vol. XI, p. 459, note 3. Bergonzi's origin in Parma - he took office in the same year, 1548 - is attested by the list of auditors of the Torrone (BoBA, MS B. 36, ff. 162r ff.).

61. *Ordinationes et reformationes officii causarum criminalium civitatis bononiensis*, apud Anselmum Giacarellum, Bononiae 1548, unnumbered pages (BoAS, Biblioteca, B.b.V.21, ff. 5r-24v).

62. PM, vol. II, pp. 1393-1400.

63. Ibid., p. 1522 and note 60. A letter from Giovio to Alessandro Farnese of 11 September 1544 also alludes to Morone's rigor in governing the Bologna legation, mentioning certain patricians whom he would have "bent" (P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. I, p. 345).

64. It is enough to mention, among those available in printed texts, the letter sent by Bembo on 28 June 1544 (P. Bembo, Lettere, cited above, vol. IV, p. 500), Giovio's letter through Alessandro Farnese of 6 May

1547 (P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 84), and the letter Priuli wrote to him on 5 November 1547, asking him to intervene in Modena, where a brother of the late Cardinal Badia was behaving "very dissolute[ly]" (PRO, 31 9/33, f. 218r). The recommendations of the cardinal-nephew were naturally very numerous; see, for example, ASV, *Segreteria di Stato. Legazioni. Bologna*, 178, ff. 2r, 4rv; 179, ff. 17r-18v, 278r-279v; PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284, letters of 7 June and 5 July 1544; ibid., 285, letter of 13 May 1548.

65. One example is provided by the three letters sent from Milan to Ferrante Gonzaga within a single week, on 8, 10, and 15 August 1548, and then again on 28 August (MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30; see PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284, letters of 14 September and 17 October 1545).

66. PM, vol. II, pp. 1522-23; ASV, *Segreteria di Stato. Legazioni. Bologna*, 178, ff. 39r, 50r, 66r, 74rv, 77r, 121r-232r, passim; see PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284, letters of 2 December 1544, 14 February and 7 November 1545.

67. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284; see also the letter of 18 October.

68. Ibid., letters of 15 August 1544 and 15 February 1545.

69. Ibid., letter of 18 July 1544.

70. BoAS, *Senato. Provvisioni*, 1541-1545, ff. 93v-96r, measure "in favor of the notaries' company," signed by Morone on 9 August 1544.

71. *Constitutiones officii causarum criminalium civitatis Bononiae*, printed without date and signed by Morone (BoAS, Biblioteca, B.b.V.21, where the analogous *Constitutiones* promulgated by the vice-legates Lorenzo Lenzi in 1556 and Pier Donato Cesi in 1560 are also preserved; another copy is in ibid., *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 45r-63v); see U. Mazzone, *Vita religiosa e vita civile*, cited above, p. 1028.

72. Candido Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna del cardinal Giovanni Gerolamo Morone vescovo di Modena (1509-1580)*, in Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi, series X, III (1968), pp. 63-102, especially p. 71.

73. BoAS, *Senato. Provvisioni*, 1541-1545, ff. 80r-89r.

74. Ibid., ff. 32v-35r; see also the bounty of five gold soldi imposed in February 1548 on those responsible for serious crimes (ibid., ff. 44v-45r).

75. In a letter to Alessandro Farnese of 16 May 1544, Morone apologized for not having chosen the candidate Farnese had recommended, since he had already appointed "a person known to me for goodness and experience, who, since he depends on me, will not dare to act contrary to my wishes, and whom I can punish without regard for anyone" (PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284).

76. See the *Provvisione di pigliare l'arme contra li homicidiali publicata in Bologna alli 24 di maggio 1548*, printed by Anselmo Giacarelli, bearing at the end the signatures of Morone and Ulisse Gozzadini, gonfalonier of justice (BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 69r-70v; other measures of the same period are in ibid., ff. 71r-82v, and in *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1543-1622 and 1534-1567; see Zita Zanardi, ed., Bononia *manifesta. Catalogo dei bandi, editti, costituzioni e provvedimenti diversi, stampati nel XVI secolo per Bologna e il suo territorio*, Olschki, Florence 1996, p. 18).

77. BoBA, MS B. 311, *Libro dei giustiziati a Bologna dal 1540 al 1792*, p. 8. The quotation is taken from the chronicle of Giovan Francesco Negri preserved ibid., MS Gozzadini 135, unnumbered folios, under the relevant date, and from the deposition of Alberto Miglioli in PM, vol. II, pp. 1317-18, from which the following quotation is also drawn.

78. Marco Bellabarba, *La giustizia nell'Italia moderna: XVI-XVIII secolo*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2008.

79. See the anonymous entry *Bentivoglio, Cornelio*, in DBI, vol. VIII, pp. 608-10.

80. I. Fosi, *La giustizia del papa*, cited above, p. 14.

81. PM, vol. II, pp. 1287-88.

82. Only during the eighteenth century did the expression “summary justice” become synonymous with rapid and arbitrary judgment (Simona Cerutti, *Giustizia sommaria. Pratiche e ideali di giustizia in una società di Ancien Régime (Torino XVIII secolo)*, Feltrinelli, Milan 2003, pp. 23-24).

83. PM, vol. II, p. 1365.

84. Ibid., pp. 1373-74, note 8.

85. Roberto Pancheri, *Scipione Pulzone, Bartolomeo Cancellieri e altre novità sull’iconografia del cardinale Giovanni Morone*, in M. Firpo and O. Niccoli, eds., Il *cardinale Giovanni Morone e l’ultima fase*, cited above, pp. 257-79, especially pp. 272-75.

86. PM, vol. II, p. 1521 and note 59. The permits granted by Morone are in BoAS, Legato. Expeditiones, 1545, 1546, 1547, 1548, passim. On the growing spread of firearms, see Piero Pieri, *Il Rinascimento e la crisi militare italiana*, Einaudi, Turin 1952, pp. 251 ff. In Bologna the phenomenon may also be placed in the context of the spread of dueling noted by Giancarlo Angelozzi, *Cultura dell’onore, codici di comportamento nobiliari e Stato nella Bologna pontificia: un’ipotesi di lavoro*, in Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento, VIII (1982), pp. 305-24.

87. BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 71r-72v; see Z. Zanardi, ed., *Bononia manifesta*, cited above, p. 18.

88. CT, vol. XI, p. 9.

89. See the *Provisione delle meretrici publiche* of 1545, reaffirmed in 1548 (BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 178r-179v; see Z. Zanardi, ed., *Bononia manifesta*, cited above, p. 18).

90. See, for example, PM, vol. II, pp. 1334, 1443.

91. BoAS, *Legato. Bandi speciali*, 1536-1563, ff. 180r-183v.

92. C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, pp. 73-76.

93. BoAS, *Senato. Provvisioni*, 1541-1545, ff. 113v-134r.

94. Thus in the chronicle of Giovan Francesco Negri (BoBA, MS Gozzadini 135, unnumbered folios).

95. PM, vol. II, p. 1329, note 55. On Bolognese precedents and the doubtful applicability of sumptuary legislation, see Maria Giuseppina Muzzarelli, *La disciplina delle apparenze. Vesti e ornamenti nella legislazione suntuaria bolognese fra XIII e XV secolo*, in P. Prodi, ed., *Disciplina dell’anima, disciplina del corpo*, cited above, pp. 757-84; Id., Guardaroba *medievale. Vesti e società dal XIII al XVI secolo*, il Mulino, Bologna 2008.

96. *Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento*, ed. Valerio Marucci, Salerno, Rome 1988, pp. 206, 210-11.

97. G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, pp. 176-77.

98. Z. Zanardi, ed., *Bononia manifesta*, cited above, pp. 16-19.

99. CT, vol. XI, p. 446, note 2.

100. C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, p. 79; PM, vol. II, p. 1464 and note 45.

101. PM, vol. II, pp. 1558-59; see also p. 1497: “I have heard from trustworthy persons that when His Lordship was a young student at the University of Padua, [...] it had never been said or heard that [...] he was subject to carnal and venereal desire.”

102. Ibid., p. 1521.

103. Pompeo Vizani, *I due ultimi libri delle historie della sua patria*, heirs of Giovanni Rossi, Bologna 1608, p. 32, which takes up Ghiselli’s text in BoBU, MS 770, vol. XIV, pp. 813-14.

104. Ibid., passim; BoAS, *Fondo legato. Bolle brevi e lettere*, 1548; U. Mazzone, “Evellant vicia... aedificent virtutes,” cited above, p. 726.

105. PM, vol. II, pp. 1305-6 and note 192.

106. CT, vol. I, p. 178, note 3. On this appointment, which Beccadelli initially wished to refuse because he was himself Bolognese, see the letter in which, in April 1544, he asked Cervini's assent; Cervini replied by leaving him entirely free to decide (PrBP, MS Palatino, 1020/3; see Antonio Giganti, *Vita di monsignor Lodovico Beccadelli*, in *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/1, pp. 1-68, especially pp. 26-27).

107. BoAS, *Fondo legato. Bolle brevi e lettere*, 1544-1547, ff. 12v-13v, 26r-27r, 28v-33v.

108. Ibid., ff. 53v-55r, Morone's bull confirming the assignment made by *motu proprio* of 13 December 1544.

109. Ibid., ff. 58r-59v, 64r, 66v-70r, 92r-93r, 96rv, 102v-104r, 127r-128v.

110. "He used to send visitors to the hospitals of the poor in the city of Bologna, such as the hospital of San Biagio, that of the Maddalena, San Francesco, and others [...]. And I was sent many times by His Most Illustrious Lordship to visit such hospitals and carry alms to them" (PM, vol. II, p. 1253).

111. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero*, 284, ff. 1v-2r; Ornella Moroni, *Carlo Gualteruzzi (1550-1577) e i corrispondenti*, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1984, pp. 274-75.

112. Defined as the set of "rituals, institutions, and practices of religious belief as these were shaped around the circumstances and goals of towns, cities and their inhabitants" by Nicholas Terpstra, *Civic Religion*, in John H. Arnold, ed., The *Oxford Handbook of Medieval Christianity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2014, pp. 148-64, especially p. 148. On urban ritual in early modern Bologna, see Umberto Mazzone, *Dal primo Cinquecento alla dominazione napoleonica*, in Paolo Prodi and Lorenzo Paolini, eds., *Storia della Chiesa di Bologna*, 2 vols., Bolis, Bergamo 1997, vol. I, pp. 205-82, especially pp. 209-12; Enzo Lodi, *Vita liturgica dal XVI secolo a* oggi, ibid., vol. II, pp. 113-38.

113. See, for example, PM, vol. II, pp. 1270, 1299.

114. Ibid., pp. 127, 1299, 1317.

115. Ibid., p. 1302; see pp. 1454-55. It should be noted that certain verbal correspondences among the Bolognese defense testimonies reveal prior coordination (M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 387).

116. "I never failed solemnly to visit the relics of Saint Stephen and to accompany the Madonna of San Luca, according to the custom of the city. And I always went on foot, which my predecessors did not do, and I did so sincerely and devoutly" (PM, vol. I, p. 453).

117. Ibid., p. 1311.

118. Ibid., p. 1317.

119. G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, pp. 137-38.

120. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, p. 353.

121. Silvio Leydi, *Sub umbra imperialis aquilae. Immagini del potere e consenso politico nella Milano di Carlo V*, Olschki, Florence 1999, p. 172; R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, pp. 468-71.

122. See above, section II.1.

123. NB1, vol. III, pp. 169-70.

124. PM, vol. I, pp. 445-48 and note 307.

125. See above, section III.5. 126. G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 57 ff.; A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della* coscienza, cited above, p. 121.

127. The indispensable reference for understanding sixteenth-century Bolognese heretical groups and movements is G. Dall'Olio's monograph *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, later summarized in the essay *Il dissenso religioso nella prima età moderna*, in Paolo Prodi and L. Paolini, eds., *Storia della Chiesa di Bologna*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 623-42; see also Camillo Renato, *Opere, documenti e testimonianze*, ed. Antonio Rotondò, Sansoni-The Newberry Library, Florence-Chicago 1968; Annalisa Angelini, *Simboli e*

questioni. L'eterodossia culturale di Achille Bocchi e dell'Hermathena, Pendragon, Bologna 2003; Silvia Ferretto, *Studenti tedeschi ed ambienti eterodossi italiani. Riflessione teologica e congettura filosofica tra Bologna e Padova*, in Uwe Israel and Michael Matheus, eds., *Protestanten zwischen Venedig und Rom in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Akademie, Berlin 2013, pp. 145-58.

128. See above, section VII.21; on what follows, see also G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 145 ff.

129. See the Italian translation Martin Lutero, *Degli ebrei e delle loro menzogne*, ed. Adelisa Malena, introduction by Adriano Prosperi, Einaudi, Turin 2000.

130. In 1563 Morone would recall having had no fewer than three chests of prohibited books delivered to Guglielmo Sirleto (Pio Paschini, *Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato*, in Id., Tre *ricerche sulla storia della Chiesa del Cinquecento*, Edizioni liturgiche, Rome 1945, pp. 155-281, especially p. 265), probably shortly after the election of Paul IV, as he himself wrote in the *confessio* regarding heterodox books that had come into his hands in previous years: "Most recently I sent them to the Apostolic Library through Messer Guglielmo [Sirleto], protonotary" (PM, vol. I, pp. 412-13).

131. PM, vol. I, pp. 451-52; see also p. 17 and note 35.

132. Morone would deny the accusation (ibid., pp. 478, 499; see also pp. 487-93, 498-99; vol. II, pp. 160-61), but the tribunal would derive an article of accusation from Scotti's statements (ibid., vol. I, p. 544).

133. Morone would say that he had never known that the recipients of those alms were heretics and that he had given them for no purpose other than "*quam amore Dei sine distinctione*" - solely from love of God, without distinction (ibid., vol. I, p. 628).

134. "But I did not do it, nor would I have done so had the order arrived; rather, I would have had it carried out, just as I always had orders carried out whenever required by the office of the Inquisition, as the friars of San Domenico in Bologna themselves can bear good witness, for I never failed them whenever they requested my aid," Morone would write in the *confessio* (ibid., p. 450; see also vol. II, pp. 176-77).

135. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 596-97, 694-97.

136. PM, vol. I, p. 47.

137. Ibid., pp. 135-36, 714-15, 719-20, 726; see also p. 545.

138. See above, section III.3. For Morone's denial that he had ever said or done anything of the kind, see PM, vol. II, pp. 168-71.

139. PM, vol. I, p. 704.

140. Ibid., pp. 772-73.

141. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1197.

142. This information is taken, by way of example, from Marcantonio Bentivoglio's deposition (ibid., pp. 1247 ff.).

143. See above, section V.4.

144. See below, section XIV.2.

145. PM, vol. I, p. 237; see pp. 692, 697.

146. Ibid., pp. 15-19, 233-38, 241-43, 692, 694-97, 699.

147. Ibid., p. 777. Morone would deny ever having uttered such words, while admitting that he might have said that "if Germany had wished to return to obedience, it would have been well to hear their arguments once again, [...] not in order to revoke - as I believe - things that cannot be revoked, but to make them understand." And if he had ever used the word "*retractare*," it would only have been in the sense of "*tractare di novo*," that is, "to negotiate anew" with adversaries and heretics in order to bring them back (ibid., pp. 752-54).

148. Ibid., pp. 1081-82; see vol. II, pp. 1596-97.

149. Ibid., pp. 575 ff.; J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Contarini, Pole, Morone*, cited above.

150. PM, vol. III, pp. 628-30.

151. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1304-5; see also pp. 1258-59 and note 49, 1360, and the index.

152. See above, section VII.4.

153. On what follows, see also Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 152-58. On Medighini, see Enrico Alberto Rivoire, *Eresia e Riforma a Brescia*, in Bollettino della Società di studi valdesi, nos. 105-6 (1959), pp. 33-57, 59-90, especially no. 105, pp. 47-48.

154. CT, vol. I, note 9, pp. 851-52.

155. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, pp. 289-90; see G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 170-71.

156. Nicholas Terpstra, *Lay Confraternities and Civic Religion in Renaissance Bologna*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1995, p. 129; see above, section VIII.3.

157. See above, section III.5.

158. See below, section XIII.3.

159. G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, p. 72; *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. 3 ff.; *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, pp. 152 ff., 156-57; PM, vol. I, p. 207 and note 13; vol. II, pp. 1211 ff., 1216.

160. See above, section VIII.3.

161. PM, vol. I, p. 464. The disputes between Bologna and Ferrara over boundaries and waters are attested by the documentation in BoAS, *Senato. Processi*, series N, books II-VIII, and ibid., *Assunteria di confini, acque e fiumi*. The Bolognese notary Alessandro Stiatici would recall having spoken "several times" with Morone "about the dispute over the boundaries and waters that our community had, and still has, with the Ferrarese" (PM, vol. II, p. 1513).

162. C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, p. 69; PM, vol. I, p. 688, note 9.

163. *La polizia sanitaria. Dall'emergenza alla gestione della quotidianità*, Proceedings of the seminar (Messina, 12-13 December 2008), ed. Livio Antonielli, Rubbettino, Soveria Mannelli 2015.

164. See the various measures collected in BoAS, *Senato. Provvisioni*, 1541-1545 and 1546-1549, passim; ASV, *Segreteria di Stato. Legazioni. Bologna*, 178, ff. 243r-246v, *Sommario di alcuni bandi publicati in Bologna al tempo della legatione del reverendissimo et illustrissimo cardinale Morono et di ordine et commissione espressa di Sua Signoria illustrissima*; PM, vol. II, pp. 593-603; Z. Zanardi, ed., *Bononia manifesta*, cited above, pp. 15-19; see C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, passim; N. Bernabei, *Vita del cardinale Giovanni Morone*, cited above, p. 50.

165. *Mercanti, eresia, Inquisizione*, ed. Germano Maifreda, special issue of Storia economica, 2014, no. 1.

166. PM, vol. II, p. 1216. In 1541 Vicar Agostino Zanetti had entrusted Bargellesi with monitoring the circulation of prohibited books (see, for example, ibid., p. 1254, note 29). Morone would recall that "while I was legate in Bologna, I received intelligence that a quantity of Lutheran books was being carried through on its way to Lucca; with great diligence I had it intercepted and sent it to the inquisitor" (ibid., vol. I, p. 415).

167. See above, section IV.2.

168. PM, vol. II, pp. 1216-17.

169. See, for example, ibid., pp. 827, 977, 984-85.

170. Ibid., pp. 846-47.

171. Tommaso Sandonnini, *Lodovico Castelvetro e la sua famiglia*, Zanichelli, Bologna 1882, pp. 170-71; see below, section XXII.4.

172. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 48, note 3. On Grechetto, see PM, vol. I, p. 554, note 15.

173. PM, vol. I, pp. 121-22; see pp. 34-35, 128-29.

174. See above, section IV.3.

175. CT, vol. X, p. 54, note 1; see PM, vol. I, p. 35, note 7; and Farnese's subsequent letter to his cousin from Dillingen an der Donau, 6-8 May (NB1, vol. VIII, p. 143).

176. See above, section III.2.

177. BAV, *Barb. lat.*, 5792, ff. 186v-188r.

178. On him and his reforming activity in Modena, in addition to PM, vol. I, p. 123, note 14, and Simona Feci's entry *Foscarari, Egidio*, in DBI, vol. XLIX, pp. 280-83, see M. M. Fontaine, *For the Good of the City*, cited above; Matteo Al Kalak, *Storia della Chiesa di Modena dal medioevo all'età contemporanea. Profili di vescovi modenesi dal 9. al 18. secolo*, Mucchi, Modena 2006, pp. 253-311; Id., *Il riformatore dimenticato. Egidio Foscarari tra Inquisizione, concilio e governo pastorale (1512-1564)*, il Mulino, Bologna 2016.

179. PM, vol. I, pp. 464-67; see also pp. 640-41; vol. II, pp. 126-26, 178, 786, 928, 1095, 1363.

180. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 269; *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/1, p. 148.

181. PM, vol. II, pp. 819-20; see pp. 120, 1363.

182. ACDF, *Stanza storica*, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 1r ff.

183. PM, vol. II, p. 1024.

184. FiAS, Urbino, I. G, 105, f. 1041r, notice from Rome of 30 August 1560.

185. Lancillotti, vol. IX, pp. 352-53, 394.

186. Ibid., p. 5; on the conspiracy, see below, section IX.4.

187. Lancillotti, vol. X, pp. 177-78.

188. PrBP, MS Palatino, 1020/1.

189. Lancillotti, vol. X, p. 215.

190. Ibid., pp. 256-57.

191. Ibid., p. 272; on the edicts, see below, section XII.1.

192. Lancillotti, vol. X, pp. 275-76, 278, 292-94, 310, 322, 324, 326, 367, 377, 386-87, 394-95, 412-13.

193. Ibid., pp. 377, 388, 466; see vol. XI, p. 174.

194. Ibid., vol. XI, p. 176.

195. Ibid., pp. 219, 275-76.

196. MoAS, *Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni*, 264, fasc. III, ff. 45r-46v, letter of 7 June.

197. Lancillotti, vol. X, p. 215; see also p. 216.

198. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 16 ff.; G. Maifreda, *I denari dell'inquisitore*, cited above, p. 42.

199. CT, vol. XI, p. 556.

200. Lancillotti, vol. X, p. 256.

201. Ibid., p. 225; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 100.

202. It is enough to refer to the studies by G. Italiano, *La pastorale eterodossa*, cited above; M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above; A. Jacobson Schutte, *Pier Paolo Vergerio*, cited above.

203. *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 350; see M. Al Kalak, Il *riformatore dimenticato*, cited above, pp. 93 ff.

204. "In 1550 *Marcantonio Flaminio* died, having already, by the grace of God, been brought back to Catholicism by Cardinal Theatino. [...] Cardinal Theatino [...] learned that Flaminio was gravely ill, entered his rooms, saw that he was breathing his last, and instead of speaking to him spoke to the crucifix; he knelt there and with tears prayed that the Lord would heal the sick man, whose bodily life and soul were in danger. The Lord miraculously heard him" (Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 994, ff. 278v-279v).

205. ACDF, *Stanza storica*, Decreta, vol. I, f. 13r; see Agostino Borromeo, *Il dissenso religioso tra il clero italiano e la prima attività del Sant'Ufficio romano*, in Per il *Cinquecento religioso italiano. Clero cultura società*, Proceedings of the conference (Siena, 27-30 June 2001), ed. Maurizio Sangalli, introduction by Adriano Prosperi, 2 vols., Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Rome 2003, vol. II, pp. 455-85, especially p. 485; Vittorio Frajese, *Nascita dell'Indice. La censura ecclesiastica dal Rinascimento alla Controriforma*, Morcelliana, Brescia 2006, pp. 62 ff.

206. See below, section XIII.2.

207. See above, section V.4.

208. G. Caravale, *Predicazione e Inquisizione*, pp. 57-58, 185, 193; M. Al Kalak, Il *riformatore dimenticato*, cited above, pp. 90-93.

209. M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above, pp. 167 ff.

210. Michelle M. Fontaine, *Making Heresy Marginal in Modena*, in R. K. Delph, M. M. Fontaine, and J. J. Martin, eds., *Heresy, Culture, and Religion*, cited above, pp. 37-51, especially pp. 44 ff., according to whom Foscarari carried out a genuine "process of privatizing heresy in Modena."

211. A slender eight-page summary of that book, entitled *Excerpta ex libro reverendissimi domini episcopi Foscararii* and listing more than seventy names, is preserved in MoAS, Inquisizione, 1, fasc. 7, no. VIII; see A. Biondi, *Streghe ed eretici*, cited above, pp. 91-92.

212. B. Fontana, *Documenti vaticani contro l'eresia*, cited above, p. 419.

213. M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, p. 245, note 263; see PM, vol. II, p. 984, note 84.

214. M. M. Fontaine, *Making Heresy Marginal in Modena*, cited above; see Jane K. Wickersham, *Rituals of Prosecution. The Roman Inquisition and the Prosecution of Philo-Protestants in Sixteenth-Century Italy*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2012, who attributes to Foscarari a personal "inclination towards the most conciliatory forms of punishment" (p. 142), which earned him "a reputation for leniency" from the very beginning of his Modenese episcopate (p. 147).

215. See below, section XII.1.

216. A. Rotondò, *Atteggiamenti della vita morale*, cited above, p. 243, note 122; M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, p. 65.

217. See below, section XI.1.

218. PM, vol. II, pp. 629-35.

219. Lancillotti, vol. X, p. 377.

IX. "He Did Not Deserve the Habit He Wore": Between Papacy and Empire

1. F. Chabod, *Carlo V e il suo impero*, cited above, pp. 225-42; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 417 ff.; L. Arcangeli, *Gentiluomini di Lombardia*, cited above, pp. 151-71. The pope had long

sought to obtain imperial assent to the enfeoffment of the duchy, involving Morone as well in the negotiations (F. Chabod, *Storia di Milano*, cited above, p. 206).

2. Roberto Zapperi, *Tiziano, Paolo III e i suoi nipoti. Nepotismo e ritratto di Stato*, Bollati-Boringhieri, Turin 1990, pp. 46 ff.

3. Pastor, vol. V, pp. 825-26.

4. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 118.

5. See the reply of the young Farnese - whose grandfather had appointed Beccadelli as tutor - of 17 October (BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 6407, f. 16r).

6. G. Fragnito, *Il nepotismo farnesiano tra ragioni di Stato e ragioni di Chiesa*, in Paolo Pecorari and Giovanni Silvano, eds., *Continuità e discontinuità nella storia politica, economica e religiosa. Studi in onore di Aldo Stella*, Neri Pozza, Vicenza 1993, pp. 117-25; Id., *Ragioni dello Stato, ragioni della Chiesa e nepotismo farnesiano. Spunti per una ricerca*, in Pierangelo Schiera, ed., *Ragion di Stato e ragioni dello Stato (secoli XV-XVII)*, Istituto italiano per gli studi filosofici, Naples 1996, pp. 28-37. Ercole Gonzaga's agent wrote that he "delivered a long speech approving the matter, founded on his theology that it is good for the Church not to possess landed property, and among the many things he said, he said that Saint Peter possessed nothing" (ibid., p. 118).

7. G. Fragnito, *Il nepotismo farnesiano*, cited above, pp. 119-25; Id., *Paolo III, papa*, in DBI, vol. LXXXI, pp. 98-107, where it is emphasized that the pope succeeded in maintaining "firm control over the Holy Office, preventing the opening of formal proceedings against prelates and cardinals of restless *spiritual*ity" (p. 105).

8. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. III ff.

9. See below, section X.1.

10. ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 42, ff. 18r-19v.

11. CT, vol. IV, p. 440. Morone replied on 29 December, asking permission to go to Milan to visit his mother and family and "then come away all the more peacefully" (ibid., note 1). Authorization reached him in Bologna on 2 January, and on the fourth he immediately set out for Modena, intending then to continue "without any further stop," as he informed Cervini that same day (ibid., vol. X, p. 346, note 2).

12. Ibid., vol. X, p. 432, note 1; ASV, *Conc. trid.*, 42, ff. 36r-40r.

13. CT, vol. X, p. 275, note 6.

14. *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa Carlo Gualteruzzi*, cited above, p. 223.

15. BoAS, *Senato. Lettere dell'ambasciatore al Senato*, 1546. The announcement of Morone's arrival in Rome on 10 February inaugurates the ambassadors' frequent visits to the legate, who on the twenty-seventh was said to be "most ardent, both because of his lordly nature and natural humanity and because of the paternal affection he shows toward Your Lordships and the city" (ibid., under the relevant date).

16. P. Paschini, *Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato*, cited above, p. 166.

17. PM, vol. II, pp. 559-63.

18. CT, vol. X, pp. 346-47.

19. On the conciliar debates, see Jedin, vol. II, pp. 193 ff.

20. CT, vol. X, p. 498, note 7.

21. Ibid., pp. 889-90; see also the following pages.

22. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 251.

23. CT, vol. X, pp. 539, 586, 589, note 3, 670; vol. XI, pp. 29, 55; see pp. 47, 65; Jedin, vol. II, p. 320.

24. M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above, p. 22.

25. P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 205.

26. Jedin, vol. II, pp. 327 ff., 344, 360.

27. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 179.

28. NB1, vol. IX, pp. 455-56, note 1; see C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, p. 263.

29. Pastor, vol. V, pp. 550 ff.; Jedin, vol. II, pp. 457 ff.; see C. Capasso, *Paolo III*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 539 ff.

30. See the detailed and apologetic reconstructions by Luigi Carcereri, *Il concilio di Trento dalla traslazione a Bologna alla sospensione. Marzo-settembre 1547*, Zanichelli, Bologna 1910, pp. 96 ff., and Jedin, vol. II, pp. 475 ff.

31. Morone took part in his solemn obsequies in San Luigi dei Francesi (Giuseppe Molini, Documenti di storia italiana copiati su gli originali autentici e per lo più autografi *esistenti in Parigi*, 2 vols., Tipografia all'insegna di Dante, Florence 1836-37, vol. II, p. 426).

32. L. Carcereri, *Il concilio di Trento dalla traslazione*, cited above, pp. 124-29.

33. Jedin, vol. III, p. 328.

34. Filippo Valenti, *Il carteggio del padre Girolamo Papino informatore estense dal concilio di Trento durante il periodo bolognese*, in Archivio storico italiano, CXXIV (1966), pp. 303-417, especially pp. 328, 335; see CT, vol. XI, p. 929; see pp. 931, 941; Renato Raffaelli, *L'inquisitore inquisito*, appendix to the essay *Notizie intorno a Francesco* Severi, "il medico di Argenta," in Studi urbinati, LVI (1983), pp. 127-36; Adriano Prosperi, *Girolamo Papino e Bernardino Ochino: documenti per la biografia di un* inquisitore, in Antonio Samaritani and Ranieri Varese, eds., *L'aquila bianca. Studi di storia estense per Luciano Chiappini*, Corbo, Ferrara 2000, pp. 283-306, now in Id., *L'Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 99-123.

35. CT, vol. XI, p. 226.

36. Ibid., p. 241.

37. Ibid., p. 898.

38. Jedin, vol. III, pp. 137 ff.

39. CT, vol. XI, pp. 250-51, 259-60; see C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, p. 281.

40. See the letter sent from Rome in August 1547 to Francesco Sfondrati (NB1, vol. X, pp. 414-18; see Jedin, vol. III, pp. 142-43).

41. NB1, vol. X, p. 435.

42. Negotiations over the extension also involved Morone (ibid., pp. 423-25), who sought to avert the formal protest threatened by Charles V and hoped “that every reasonable and tolerable course might be explored so as not to allow such dissension to enter Christendom” (ibid., pp. 425-26; see also pp. 432-37).

43. Jedin, vol. III, pp. 125 ff.

44. PM, vol. II, pp. 584-88, Morone’s letter to Alessandro Farnese of 10 September 1547.

45. See below, section II.5.

46. PM, vol. II, pp. 589-90.

47. Ibid., p. 1018; see pp. 927-28.

48. Ibid., p. 885. On 15 August Paolo Giovio wrote to Alessandro Farnese that Carafa “gave Cardinal Morone a vigorous dressing-down in harsh words during the debate over the transfer, because Morone said that he approved it, but subject to imperial authorization; at those words you should have seen the forked tongue of the Tarasque of Sainte-Marthe [a mythical dragon], which spat out quod erat indignus purpura [that he was unworthy of the purple]” (P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 38).

49. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, *Capilupi Ippolito*, 1.

50. A. Menniti Ippolito, *Paolo III e monsignor Della Casa*, cited above, p. 143.

51. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1916, avviso romano del 14 ottobre.

52. See above, section IX.1.

53. PM, vol. II, p. 604, note 1.

54. CT, vol. XI, p. 902; under 24 August it was reported that Morone “is constantly trying to come to Bologna in order to go on to Milan and rest there, and as soon as he receives permission he will set out.”

55. Ibid., vol. I, p. 700; vol. XI, pp. 273-74; see p. 276, note 3; G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, p. 175; and PM, vol. II, pp. 591-92, the letter of 13 September in which Alessandro Farnese instructed Morone to “make ready and proceed as soon as possible to his legation, […] where he will attend no less to the affairs of the council than to the office of legate for the city.”

56. CT, vol. VI/1, p. 476.

57. Ibid., vol. IV, pp. 277-79; see also pp. 281-82, 285, 302, 305, 310, 313, 315-16, 329- 30; see vol. I, pp. 700 ff.

58. See above, section I.2.

59. F. Rurale, *Pio IV*, cited above

60. P. Scaramella, *Una memoria non condivisa. L’immagine del cardinal Morone da Frickius a Jedin*, in M. Firpo e O. Niccoli (eds.), *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l’ultima fase*, cited above, p. 226.

61. Paolo Masini, *Bologna perlustrata. Parte terza*, per l’erede di Vittorio Benacci, Bologna 1666 [1st ed. 1650], p. 213; see also the contemporary chronicles of Anton Francesco Ghiselli, who gave voice to the hostility of his social order toward Morone’s energetic government (BoBU, ms 770, vol. XIV, pp. 858-59), and of Giovan Francesco Negri (BoBa, ms *Gozzadini* 135).

62. CT, vol. I, p. 720.

63. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l’imperatore*, cited above, p. 210.

64. PM, vol. II, p. 1469, note 8.

65. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 285.

66. Here we correct, against the original (SAG, Estado, 1193, nos. 36-38), the text published by Giovanni Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali per occupare Bologna al tempo del concilio*, in “Il concilio di Trento,” II (1943), no. 4, pp. 356-67, especially pp. 358-59.

67. In an imperial secretary's endorsement of Gonzaga's letter, it is stated that the king saw no sound reason that could legitimize the enterprise, since Bologna was well known to be a possession of the Church and an attempt to seize it would give just cause for war, not only to the Holy See (SAG, Estado, 1193, no. 33).

68. Meanwhile, Don Ferrante had kept the Bentivoglio option open (G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, pp. 360-61).

69. See above, section II.4.

70. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 358.

71. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Factions in the Sacred College in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*, in Gianvittorio Signorotto e Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds.), *Courts and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, pp. 99-131, especially pp. 102-4.

72. NB1, vol. X, pp. 593-94.

73. See above, Introduction.

74. CT, vol. XI, pp. 337, note 2, 338-39; see pp. 340, 345, and the letter sent to Morone on 15 January 1548 by Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo of Trent, then in Augsburg, in which he voiced his profound concern over the extreme tension in relations between pope and emperor, now reduced "to the troubled state that I see emerging, so that I fear the ship in such a storm may run upon some rock" (ibid., pp. 348-49).

75. Ibid., pp. 607-11.

76. NB1, vol. X, pp. 441-45.

77. PM, vol. II, pp. 604-6.

78. On him, see Franca Petrucci, *Cattaneo, Aurelio*, in DBI, vol. XXII, pp. 418-21.

79. PM, vol. II, pp. 338-39.

80. Pastor, vol. V, pp. 829-30.

81. Ibid., pp. 592 ff.; Jedin, vol. III, pp. 227 ff.

82. F. Valenti, *Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino*, cited above, p. 369.

83. See his letter of 19 February 1548 (G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 361).

84. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 211.

85. PrBP, Epistolario scelto, 104, *Giovanni Girolamo Morone*.

86. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 212-13.

87. CT, vol. XI, p. 340.

88. PM, vol. I, pp. 755-56; on him, see Michele Di Sivo, *Giacomelli, Giacomo*, in DBI, vol. LIII, pp. 134-39.

89. CT, vol. XI, p. 347, letter of Massarelli al Cervini del 10 gennaio 1548.

90. Ibid., p. 346, letter of Del Monte al Cervini del 7 gennaio 1548.

91. Ibid., p. 349.

92. Ibid., p. 352, note 2.

93. Ibid., pp. 354, note 4, 370.

94. Ibid., pp. 743-44.

95. Paola Zambelli, *Benazzi, Lattanzio*, in DBI, vol. VIII, p. 181. Some of these printed prognostications are preserved at BoBA for the years 1545 (16. P. III. 36), 1547 (16. P. III. 42), and 1548 (16. P. III. 44).

96. CT, vol. XI, p. 374.

97. F. Chabod, *Storia di Milano*, cited above, pp. 196 ff.; see Giampiero Brunelli, Gonzaga, Ferrante, in DBI, vol. LVII, pp. 734-44.

98. *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa Carlo Gualteruzzi*, cited above, p. 464.

99. Massarelli recorded the rumors that Morone's life was in danger (CT, vol. I, p. 767; see pp. 769-70), and in his letter to Cervini of 19 May announced the visit of one of Morone's collaborators, who had been charged with asking him to "intercede with Our Lord to free him from this legation of Bologna, though with some honorable compensation" (ibid., vol. XI, p. 417).

100. C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, p. 84. Even when, on 1 October 1551, Julius III considered sending Morone as legate to the king of France, he had to abandon the idea "because he understood that Morone was unwell, and therefore did not wish to nominate him, lest people say that he was appointing sick men" (NB1, vol. XII, p. 70, note 3).

101. Hieronymi Cardani mediolanensis, *Opera omnia in decem tomos digesta*, vol. IX, sumptibus Ioannis Antonii Huguetan, et Marci Antonii Ravaud, Lugduni 1663, pp. 230-31; the dating between 1564 and 1570 is suggested by Nancy G. Siraisi, *The Clock and the Mirror. Girolamo Cardano and Renaissance Medicine*, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ) 1997, p. 262, note 33.

102. Vincenzo Mantovani, *Vita di Girolamo Cardano*, Gio. Battista Sonzogno, Milano 1821, p. 20.

103. Ibid., pp. 207-9; see p. 71.

104. In October 1570 Cardano was arrested and forced to abjure *de vehementi*. Again on Morone's advice, he tried to place himself under the direct protection of Pius V, who nevertheless refused to grant him the pension requested by the cardinal himself (Giuliano Gliozzi, *Cardano, Gerolamo*, in DBI, vol. XIX, pp. 758-63; Katia Pischedda and Silvana Seidel Menchi, *La politica del dissenso. Cristoforo Madruzzo e gli eterodossi*, in Paola Giacomoni and Luigi Dappiano, eds., *Jacopo Aconcio. Il pensiero scientifico e l'idea di tolleranza*, Editrice universitaria, Trent 2005, pp. 155-69). Referring again to the year 1570, Cardano called Morone his "patron," while recounting the curious episode of a consultation intended for him that had gone missing. The scientist later interpreted its recovery as a sign of the "hope already inspired in me by Morone's humanity and wisdom" (V. Mantovani, *Vita di Girolamo Cardano*, cited above, pp. 255-56).

105. On 21 May 1548 Del Monte informed Cervini from Bologna that he had been engaged in "the censure of the Interim, which suddenly fell upon us together with the replies of the Catholic electors and princes of Germany" (CT, vol. XI, p. 417; see NB1, vol. X, p. 329). Some notes by Morone on a memorial from the Saxon ambassador concerning the Augsburg Interim would be enclosed with the dossier of defensive documents submitted by the Milanese cardinal to the Holy Office (PM, vol. II, pp. 612-16).

106. See above, section II.3.

107. On 1 July 1547 Massarelli recorded in his diary that he had visited Morone, who showed him the letters in which Cardinals Farnese and Cervini had informed him of the pope's intention to provide for his needs as soon as the Bolognese legation ended, and announced his imminent departure for Milan (CT, vol. I, pp. 776, note 9, 777).

108. Ibid., vol. I, p. 771; vol. XI, p. 425; see infra, section X.4.

109. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 267.

110. G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, p. 202.

111. See Massarelli's note (CT, vol. I, p. 774). On the same day the Bolognese ambassadors in Rome wrote to the Senate that "it is being said publicly here that the most reverend and illustrious legate there is to be replaced" (BoAS, *Senato. Lettere dell'ambasciatore al* Senato, 1548, under the relevant date).

112. C. Mesini, *La legazione a Bologna*, cited above, p. 90.

113. F. Valenti, *Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino*, cited above, pp. 384-85.

114. The brief appointing Cardinal Del Monte to head the Bolognese legation in Morone's place - the pope stated that he needed Morone for other urgent affairs - is dated 13 July 1548 (PM, vol. II, p. 1469, note 8; the text is in CT, vol. VI/1, pp. 827-28).

115. F. Valenti, *Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino*, cited above, p. 387; see Massarelli's letter to Cervini of 18 July 1548 (CT, vol. XI, p. 446; see vol. I, p. 780). G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, p. 202, records Morone's departure from Bologna on the thirteenth.

116. CT, vol. I, p. 775.

117. Alain Tallon, *Claude d'Urfé ambassadeur de François Ier et de Henri II au concile de Trente-Bologna*, in "Revue d'histoire diplomatique", CIX (1997), pp. 195-216.

118. See above, section IX.1.

119. María José Bertomeu Masiá, *La guerra secreta de Carlos V contra el papa. La cuestión de Parma y Piacenza en la correspondencia del cardenal Granvela*, Universitat de València - Universidad de Murcia, València-Murcia 2009, p. 72.

120. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 149-50, 197-200, especially p. 198. On 15 March 1548 Gonzaga had the audacity to summon Del Monte, legate and *de facto* president of the council, to appear before two laymen: an unheard-of and memorable act, Massarelli commented, which made plain to everyone the methods followed in the State of Milan, a dominion of the emperor (CT, vol. I, p. 752).

121. CT, vol. XI, p. 432.

122. "Don Ferrando replied that justice would not be lacking, but that he was surprised Cardinal Morone should ask for the benefices of living men who had not yet been deprived and whose posts were not vacant," Massarelli wrote to Cervini on 4 July 1548 (ibid.).

123. M. Pasquali e M. Ferretti, *Cronotassi critica*, cited above, p. 134.

124. F. Valenti, *Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino*, cited above, p. 388.

125. CT, vol. I, p. 780; vol. XI, p. 442; see p. 444, note 1.

126. As Massarelli immediately wrote to Cervini on 21 July (ibid., vol. I, p. 782).

127. Ibid., vol. XI, p. 446, note 2, Massarelli a Cervini, n.d.

128. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 331; see PM, vol. I, p. 1193.

129. See below, section XXV.1.

130. It seems very difficult to us to share the positive assessment of Paul III's reforming commitment proposed by Elizabeth G. Gleason, Who Was the First Counter-Reformation Pope?, in "The Catholic Historical Review," LXXXI (1995), pp. 173-84.

131. PM, vol. II, p. 1469, note 8.

132. See below, section X.1.

133. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 254-55.

134. Lattanzio Benazzi, *Pronostico […] al reverendissimo et illustrissimo cardinale Morono, dell'alma città di Bologna legato dignissimo, et alli magnifici signori Quaranta, regimento di quella, sopra l'anno 1548*, Bartolomeo Bonardo, Bologna 1548, unnumbered pages (BoBa, 16. P. III. 44).

135. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, tav. iii.

136. P. Paschini, *Guglielmo Sirleto prima del cardinalato*, cited above, pp. 166-67.

137. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 366.

138. On 19 March 1548, for example, Morone thanked the grand chancellor of Milan, Francesco Taverna, for the support he had given to a case involving Morone's brother-in-law (MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30).

139. CT, vol. I, p. 783; see also p. 784, which shows that only three days later the new cardinal legate informed Alessandro Farnese of the affair.

140. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, pp. 361-62.

141. CT, vol. I, p. 797. On conspiracy as an "inexact crime […] which has a vague circumference and more than one center," see Kate Lowe, *The Political Crime of* Conspiracy in Fifteenth- and *Sixteenth-Century Rome*, in Trevor Dean and Kate Lowe, eds., *Crime, Society and the Law in Renaissance Italy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994, pp. 184-203, especially p. 186; Diego Quaglioni, *La congiura dei* canonisti. "Coniuratio" e "conspiratio" nel commento al "Decretum" di Juan de *Torquemada (1457*), in *Congiure e conflitti. L'affermazione della signoria pontificia su Roma nel Rinascimento: politica, cultura e economia*, Proceedings of the conference (Rome, 3-5 December 2013), ed. Myriam Chiabò, Maurizio Gargano, Anna Modigliani, and Patricia Osmond, Roma nel Rinascimento, Rome 2014, pp. 21-38.

142. PrAS, *Gonzaga di Guastalla*, 42/6, fasc. 71-8, ff. 3-6. It was necessary to correct G. Drei's edition, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 362, at several points.

143. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1917, ff. n. n.

144. The Spanish cardinal emphasized the extremely difficult situation in which his Milanese colleague found himself, although the pope and Alessandro Farnese had reassured him; he also reported that Morone had said he regarded his brother-in-law as a reckless man who had talked himself into that predicament (CT, vol. XI, p. 472).

145. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 363, letter from Ippolito Capilupi to Ercole Gonzaga of 1 October (the text, however, has been checked against the original in PrAS, *Gonzaga di Guastalla*, 42/6, fasc. 71-8, ff. 13r-14r).

146. Ibid.

147. Ibid., ff. 14v-15r; see G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 364; *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa Carlo Gualteruzzi*, cited above, p. 515, letter from Carlo Gualteruzzi to Giovanni Della Casa of 13 October.

148. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 364.

149. FiAS, Mediceo, 4306, ff. 252-61.

150. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 364.

151. BoAS, *Legato. Absolutiones*, 1549, ff. 44v-45r; see his letter of 7 July 1566 (ibid., *Senato. Lettere di diversi al Senato*, 1562-1580; see also ibid., under 5 July 1566). On him, see also SAG, Estado, 1195, no. 34, letter from Ferrante Gonzaga to Charles V of 16 October; PM, vol. I, p. 1271, note 15.

152. NB1, vol. V, pp. 207, 210, 219; see vol. VI, p. 250.

153. G. Rinieri, *Cronaca, 1535-1549*, cited above, p. 241; BoBU, ms 1107, vol. VII/2, f. 118r; PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 286, passim; ibid., 287, under 3 May 1555, 8 April and 31 August 1556; ibid., 288, under 16 December 1559 and 14 March 1561. As late as July 1560, at Carlo Borromeo's request, the Venetian government granted a new "safe-conduct for the next five years to the said Captain Fioravanti, just as one had already been granted to him in 1557" (VeAS, *Capi del Consiglio dei Dieci. Lettere secrete*, 1560-1565, under 20 July 1560).

154. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 363.

155. *Corrispondenza Giovanni Della Casa Carlo Gualteruzzi*, cited above, pp. 525-26.

156. BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 14835, f. 212r; on the pseudo-Ochino letter, edited by Karl Benrath, *Lettera a Paolo III. Documento sconosciuto del secolo XVI*, in "La Rivista cristiana," II (1874), pp. 257-72, see E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 226 ff.

157. Lancillotti, vol. IX, p. 436.

158. Ibid., vol. X, p. 5.

159. NB1, vol. XI, p. 119.

160. Ibid., p. 130; see also the following pages. Bertano had been sent to the imperial court as extraordinary nuncio after the death of Pier Luigi Farnese.

161. See the summary of the letter from his secretary Fernando de Montesa of 21 February 1548, which informed him of what had happened and emphasized that the cardinal would emerge well from that affair (SAG, Estado, 875, no. 62; see NB1, vol. XI, pp. 716-18, 723, 728-30, 752).

162. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 366.

163. Ibid., pp. 366-67. As early as 16 October the governor of Milan had urged Charles V to intervene, without concealing his own role in the affair: "Your Majesty will have learned from letters from Rome of the arrest of Catalano Gallarà, Cardinal Morone's brother-in-law, caused by the statement of a Captain Fioravanti who lives in Bologna, who says that Catalano negotiated with the duke of Florence and with me to seize Bologna and place it in Your Majesty's hands; and you will also have learned that Catalano confessed it. The cardinal, his brother-in-law, and his other relatives are therefore sending a special courier to beg Your Majesty graciously to take him under your protection and obtain his safety, either by way of grace, requesting it from the pope, or by way of justice, saying that you wish to have him in your hands as your vassal in order to punish him if he deserves punishment. I humbly beg Your Majesty to give this matter consideration and to bear in mind that such things may arise every day, and that unless the zeal with which such men move in your service is in some way appreciated and defended, services of this kind will easily become ever scarcer. […] Your Majesty is obliged to help him both because of his person and because of the obligation under which he has placed Your Majesty by seeking to render you so signal a service, as well as because of the circumstances, all his relatives being most devoted to Your Majesty" (SAG, Estado, 1195, no. 34).

164. See above, section IX.2.

165. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 358.

166. See above, section VIII.2.

167. F. Valenti, *Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino*, cited above, pp. 404-5.

168. Ibid., p. 407.

169. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 286.

170. MnAS, *Archivio Capilupi*, 37, no. 543. The case still had to be decided at the end of June, when Morone may already have left for his summer holiday at Capranica (ibid., no. 557).

171. Dario Busolini, *Filareto, Partenio Apollonio*, in DBI, vol. XLVII, pp. 609-12.

172. Renzo Ristori, *Benedetto Accolti. A proposito di un riformato toscano del Cinquecento*, in "Rinascimento", II (1962), pp. 225-312.

173. His sister Caterina Cibo, duchess of Camerino, who had been dispossessed by the Farnese, had also found refuge at the Medici court. Cibo was constantly fleeing Rome, where in 1544 Paul III had gone so far as to threaten him with excommunication; see E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, pp. 140 ff.; Franca Petrucci, *Cibo, Innocenzo* di, in DBI, vol. XXV, pp. 249-55. See Serristori's dispatches of 19, 21, 23, and 31 October, 4 and 7 November 1548, 13, 19, and 21 January, 4, 5, 9, and 16 February, and 14 and 21 June 1549, in FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, ff. 45r-53v, 76r-77v, 80r-83v, 85r-89r, 123v-124v.

174. Mario Fanti, *Un progetto di riforma del Senato e una vicenda di eresia a Bologna alla metà del Cinquecento*, in "L'Archiginnasio", LXXIX (1984), pp. 313-35.

175. Nicholas Terpstra, *Cultures of Charity. Women, Politics, and the Reform of Poor Relief in Renaissance Italy*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA) 2013, pp. 127-28.

176. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, ff. 34v-35r. On him, see Alessandra Contini, *Aspects of Medicean Diplomacy in the Sixteenth Century*, in Daniela Frigo, ed., *Politics and Diplomacy in Early Modern Italy. The Structure*

of Diplomatic Practice, 1450-1800, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2000, pp. 49-94, especially pp. 67-68.

177. BAV, *Vat. lat.*, 6407, f. 12rv.

178. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, f. 34rv.

179. Ibid., ff. 34v-35v, letter of 21 settembre; see also ibid., ff. 35v-37v.

180. See below, section XIII.1.

181. E. Bonora, *Roma 1564. La congiura contro il papa*, Laterza, Roma-Bari 2011, pp. 131, 135.

182. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, f. 40rv, letter of 4 ottobre.

183. Ibid., ff. 37v-39r; on Lottini of Volterra, a man of culture who entered Cosimo's service in the 1540s and was entrusted with delicate secret missions—including, in 1548, the assassination of Lorenzino de' Medici—see Stefano Tabacchi, Lottini, *Giovanfrancesco*, in DBI, vol. LXVI, pp. 195-200.

184. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, ff. 40v-42v. In a dispatch of 1 October Serristori informed Cosimo that "the proceedings opened against Signor Catalano […] will serve […] to show that Signor Don Ferrando did not cease fomenting plots after the Piacenza affair, that he intended to occupy Bologna and perhaps, as I said in other letters, to provide a counterweight to what had been plotted against [his] life" (ibid., f. 43rv).

185. Ibid., f. 43v.

186. Ibid., f. 46rv.

187. Ibid., f. 88v.

188. Ibid., ff. 98rv, 100v, 102r-103v, letters of Serristori al Lottini del 22 e 29 marzo e del 3 aprile 1549.

189. Ibid., ff. 106r-107r; see also the dispatch of the Mantuan ambassador in Rome of 5 April: "Morone is likely to suffer great trouble because of the arrest of his secretary and the malice of men, although all men of judgment hold it certain that His Lordship can bear no guilt in what is being investigated" (M. J. Bertomeu Masiá, *La guerra secreta de Carlos V*, cited above, p. 333).

190. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, f. 107rv. In his note Carabelli confessed that the five hours of torture during which he had been suspended by the rope "had forced him to say that his most reverend patron had known of Signor Catalano's plans, but that everything had been falsely said by him, and he begged that compassion be shown him" (ibid., f. 108rv).

191. G. Drei, *Le congiure degli imperiali*, cited above, p. 363.

192. See above, section V.2.

193. E. Bonora, *Aspettando l'imperatore*, cited above, p. 269.

194. See the letter sent from Rome on 21 April 1549 by Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza y Bobadilla to Granvelle, informing him that Morone was in difficulty, although his good conscience and virtue afforded him the greatest possible assurances (M. J. Bertomeu Masiá, *La guerra secreta de Carlos V*, cited above, p. 340). Granvelle too had received a request for help from Morone (ibid., p. 317).

195. FiAS, Mediceo, 3466, f. 114r, letter of 30 aprile 1549.

196. Ibid., f. 394r.

197. Ibid., f. 130v.

198. G. Fragnito, *Paolo III*, cited above

199. E. Bonora, *Roma 1564*, cited above, p. 139; N. Terpstra, *Cultures of Charity*, cited above, pp. 127-28; see the dispatch of 10 November 1549, which stated "that the secretary [Carabelli] will remain in prison" (BoAS, *Senato. Lettere dell'ambasciatore al* Senato, 1548).

X. “Poor and of Such High Reputation in This College”: In the Curia of Julius III

1. See below, section XII.1.

2. PM, vol. II, p. 1019; see M. FIRPO , *La presa di potere*, cited above, p. XIV .

3. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. III ff.

4. E. SOLMI , *La fuga di Bernardino Ochino*, cited above, p. 51.

5. MaBNE, ms 18.417, ff. 402-14, especially f. 413.

6. SAG, Estado, 881, no. 28.

7. CLARE ROBERTSON , “Il Gran Cardinale”. Alessandro Farnese, Patron of the Arts, Yale University Press, New Haven - London 1992, p. 292.

8. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1917, under the relevant date.

9. AMADIO RONCHINI , *Lettere di Girolamo Muzio giustinopolitano, conservate nell’Archivio governativo di Parma*, F. Carmignani, Parma 1864, p. 109.

10. *Briefe von Andreas Masius und seinen Freunden 1538 bis 1573*, ed. by Max Lossen, Alphons Dürr, Leipzig 1886, p. 53.

11. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1918, ff. 455r-457v.

12. M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above, pp. 3 ff.; e con nuovi documenti e prospettive E. Bonora, *Aspettando l’imperatore*, cited above, pp. 246 ff.; see PASTOR, vol. V, pp. 3 ff.

13. A. Ronchini, *Lettere di Girolamo Muzio*, cited above, pp. 111, 114.

14. CT, vol. XI, p. 530, note 1; *Legazioni di Averardo Serristori ambasciatore di Cosimo I a Carlo quinto e in corte di Roma (1537-1568*), ed. by Giuseppe Canestrini, Le Monnier, Firenze 1853, p. 215.

15. P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, p. 84.

16. Madrid, Biblioteca de Palacio Real, ms II. 2252, ff. 331v.

17. FiAS, Mediceo, 3966, f. 98v; see ibid., 3966A, f. 33r; 3968, f. 8r.

18. M. Firpo e F. Biferali, *Immagini ed eresie*, cited above, pp. 244 ff.

19. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. III, p. 346.

20. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, p. 832.

21. FiAS, Mediceo, 3698, f. 8r.

22. CT, vol. II, p. 42 and note 1.

23. August von Druffel, *Beiträge zur Reichsgeschichte*, 4 vols., M. Rieger’sche Universität-Buchhandlung, München 1873-96, vol. I, pp. 307-8.

24. CT, vol. II, pp. 43-48.

25. A. von Druffel, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 324-25.

26. CT, vol. XI, p. 972.

27. A. von Druffel, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 307-9, 328-29.

28. P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 162.

29. Thomas F. Mayer e Peter E. Starenko, *An Unknown Diary of Julius III’s Conclave by Bartolomeo Stella, a Servant of Cardinal Pole*, in “Annuarium historiae conciliorum”, XXIV (1992), pp. 345-75, see p. 357.

30. *Algunas cartas de don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, escritas 1538-1552*, ed. by Alberto Vázquez e Robert Selden Rose, Yale University Press, New Haven 1935, p. 183.

31. P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 157.

32. SAG, Estado, 879, no. 72.

33. The older cardinals could not accept that a forty-three-year-old man considered himself capable of becoming pope, Don Pedro de Toledo wrote to Cosimo de' Medici on 22 December 1549 (FiAS, Mediceo, 3969, f. 33r).

34. See his letter to Don Diego *Hurtado de Mendoza* of 20 November 1549 (CT, vol. XI, p. 525; see pp. 528, 536, 539, note 1, 925, 975).

35. PM, vol. II, p. 1537.

36. FiAS, Mediceo, 1175, f. 376r; CT, vol. II, pp. 48, 56.

37. P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 154.

38. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 888, f. 33v: CT, vol. II, p. 94; see A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 88.

39. PM, vol. II, p. 1055.

40. Ibid., vol. I, p. 430.

41. Ibid., vol. III, p. 135.

42. See the long letter sent to him from Pisa on 10 February 1550, a few days after the election, published in Abel Desjardins and Giuseppe Canestrini, eds., *Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane*, 6 vols., Imprimerie imperiale, Paris 1859-86, vol. III, pp. 241-44.

43. H. Jedin, *Il cardinal Pole e Vittoria Colonna*, cited above, p. 524.

44. T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, p. 176; see, by the same author, *Il fallimento di una candidatura*: il partito della riforma, *Reginald Pole* e il conclave di *Giulio III*, in "Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento," XXI (1995), pp. 41-67 (see pp. 42 ff., 56, 61), also published with some changes as The War of the Two Saints: The *Conclave of Julius III and Cardinal Pole* in Mayer's collection of essays *Cardinal Pole in European Context*: A "Via Media" in the Reformation, Ashgate, Aldershot 2000, no. IV.

45. See above, section IV.4.

46. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, p. 48. The Florentine protonotary nevertheless wished to clarify that he had thought Morone "was Pole's rival, not his enemy" (ibid., p. 52).

47. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, pp. 310-11.

48. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 492.

49. Morone would write thus to Ercole Gonzaga on 7 November 1550 (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1920).

50. Pole, *Epistolae*, vol. IV, pp. 47-50; on the short treatise, later published at Louvain in 1569, see T. F. Mayer, A Reluctant Author: Cardinal Pole and His Manuscripts, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia 1999, pp. 75-80; idem, *Il fallimento di una candidatura*, cited above, pp. 62 ff.; idem, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 176-79; A. Prosperi, *L'eresia del Libro Grande*, cited above, pp. 180 ff.

51. m. Flaminio, Lettere, cited above, p. 191.

52. T. F. Mayer e P. E. Starenko, *An Unknown Diary*, cited above, p. 366.

53. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, *Pole y Paulo IV. Una célebre Apología inédita del cardenal inglés (1557*), now in his collection of essays *Fray Bartolomé Carranza y el cardenal Pole*, cited above, pp. 199-223.

54. *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 304.

55. CT, vol. II, pp. 43, note 2, 47-48, note 2.

56. *Algunas cartas de don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza*, cited above, p. 145.

57. S. Pagano e C. Ranieri, *Nuovi documenti*, cited above, pp. 43 ff.

58. PM, vol. I, p. 1156.

59. See above, section X.1.

60. See below, section X.3.

61. See above, section V.3.

62. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 611, note 2.

63. [P. P. Vergerio], *Il catalogo de' libri*, cited above, pp. g[iiii]v (published in P. P. Vergerio, Scritti *capodistriani*, vol. II, cited above, p. 263). On the former bishop of Capodistria's anti-Nicodemite polemic against the *spirituali*, see Silvano Cavazza, "Quei che vogliono Cristo senza croce." Vergerio e i prelati riformatori italiani (1549-1555), in *Pier Paolo Vergerio il* Giovane, cited above, pp. 107-41.

64. PM, vol. I, p. 218; see *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, p. 611, note 2.

65. PM, vol. I, p. 78; see pp. 60 ff.

66. [P. P. Vergerio], *Il catalogo de' libri*, cited above, pp. g[i]v, [gvii]v, [gviii]v (P. P. Vergerio, Scritti *capodistriani*, vol. II, cited above, pp. 255 ff.); see also, by the same Vergerio, *Le otto defensioni*, n.p. [Giacomo Parco, Basel 1550], pp. Aiiiiv, [dviii]v, and *Oratione che dovea esser fatta ad un cardinale che dovea passare*, n.p., p. [biv]v.

67. See above, section IX.1.

68. PM, vol. II, pp. 1018-19. On 3 August 1555 Ludovico Beccadelli would write from Rome to Giovanni Gondola that "it is impossible to believe the delays of this court. The pope is old and, by long habit, very slow in conducting business. […] Thus matters are brought to conclusion only with difficulty" (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, f. 109rv).

69. PM, vol. II, pp. 1017-18.

70. See above, section IX.1.

71. Hieronymi Seripandi, *Diarium de vita sua, 1513-1562*, ed. by David Gutiérrez, in "Analecta augustiniana", XXVI (1963), pp. 5-193, see p. 109; CT, vol. II, p. 449.

72. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1920, under the relevant date.

73. A. Ronchini, *Lettere di Girolamo Muzio*, cited above, p. 152.

74. Don Diego de Mendoza described him in those terms in a letter to Nicolas Perrenot de Granvelle of 3 May 1550 (CT, vol. XI, p. 550). Matteo Dandolo would also speak of the pope's "very choleric nature" in his *Relazione* of 1551 (*Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. III, p. 353).

75. *Historia delle vite de' sommi pontefici dal Salvator nostro sino a Gregorio XV, scritta già da Battista Platina cremonese, dal padre fra Onofrio Panvinio da Verona […]*, appresso i Giunti, Venice 1622, pp. 281, 283; see CT, vol. II, p. 148. For what follows as well, see Massimo Firpo and Fabrizio Biferali, "Navicula Petri." L'arte dei papi *nel Cinquecento* 1527-1571, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2009, pp. 193 ff.; M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above, pp. 52 ff.

76. Heinrich Bullinger, *Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, ed. Traugott Schiess, 3 vols., Basler Buch- und Antiquariatshandlung, Basel 1904, vol. I, p. 178; [Pier Paolo Vergerio], *Epistolae duae duorum amicorum*, n.p. [1555], edited by P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 243-52, especially p. 249.

77. Antonio Caracciolo, *Vita et gesti di Giovan Pietro Carafa cioè di Paolo IIII pontefice* massimo, Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, ms 349, ff. 286v-287r.

78. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, p. 761; see also pp. 748, 751, 785, 831.

79. Matteo Dandolo described him in these terms (*Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 355-56; see CT, vol. II, pp. 174-75; Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 50-53).

80. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 110 ff., 598 ff.; see CT, vol. XIII/1, pp. 163 ff.

81. FiAS, Mediceo, 3467, f. 200rv, letter from Averardo Serristori to Cosimo de' Medici of 18 February 1551.

82. CT, vol. II, pp. 193, 198, 199; vol. XI, p. 562 and note 2, 585.

83. Ibid., vol. II, p. 198; see pp. 193, 204, 216; vol. VII/1, pp. 3 ff.; vol. XI, pp. 562, 585; and especially vol. XIII/1, pp. 163 ff.; see Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 13 ff., and, by the same author, *Proposte e progetti di riforma del collegio cardinalizio*, in idem, *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, cited above, pp. 156-92, especially pp. 180 ff.

84. NB1, vol. XV, p. 234.

85. CT, vol. XIII, pp. 261-90.

86. Giovanni Francesco Commendone, *Discorso sopra la corte di Roma*, ed. by Cesare Mozzarelli, Bulzoni, Roma 1996, p. 113; see G. Fragnito, *Il nepotismo farnesiano*, cited above, pp. 229-30.

87. CT, vol. II, p. 405.

88. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 28v ff.

89. Ibid., f. 11r.

90. See below, section XV.1.

91. *Discorso fatto dal cardinale di Mantova a monsignor di Fano a li 12 di marzo 1551* (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1921, ff. 302r-307v).

92. See ibid., 1918, ff. 455r-457v, the letter to his brother Ferrante of 12 November 1549.

93. Oltre a Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 56 ff., see Giampiero Brunelli, *Giulio III*, in DBI, vol. LVII, pp. 26-36.

94. Jedin, vol. III, pp. 307 ff.

95. See below, section XII.1.

96. NB1, vol. XIII, p. 219.

97. SAG, Estado, 880, nos. 160-61.

98. See above, section IX.3.

99. MiAGS, XLI. E. 8 (9), *Procura del signor cardinale Giovanni Morone nella signora marchesa Anna Morone Stampa per l'amministrazione de' di lui beni nei luoghi di Ninguarda e Rovederio*; ibid., XLI. G. (6), *Esiggenze e pagamenti fatti dalla signora marchesa Anna Morone Stampa sulla sostanza del signor cardinale Giovanni Morone in tempo che fu dalla medesima amministrata (1570-1577*); MnAS, *Archivio Casati Stampa*, reg. 311, f. 1v, *Libro delle entrade del signor cardinal Morone 1564 per tutto l'anno 1581*; ibid., f. 2r, *Libro de conti del signor cardinal Morone manegiati in Milano dalla signora marchesa di Soncino dal 1565 per tutto il 1580*; see also ibid., ff. [31]v, [32]v.

100. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1920.

101. APUG, ms Greg., 685, f. 102v.

102. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. III, p. 342.

103. R. Pancheri, *Scipione Pulzone, Bartolomeo Cancellieri*, cited above, p. 279 e fig. 12.

104. PM, vol. II, pp. 925-26.

105. CT, vol. X, p. 346.

106. FiAS, Mediceo, 1170a, f. 573r.

107. Pierre Hurtubise, La “table” d’un cardinal de la Renaissance. Aspects de la cuisine et de l’hospitalité à Rome au milieu du XVIe siècle, in “Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Moyen Âge, Temps modernes,” XCII (1980), pp. 249-82, especially p. 282; see pp. 267-68; idem, *Une famille-témoin. Les Salviati*, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1985, p. 275. For what follows as well, see our essay *Vivere (e morire) da cardinale*. L’“inventario” dell’eredità e la sepoltura di Giovanni Morone (1580-1581), in “Rivista storica italiana,” CXXVIII (2016), pp. 5-54, especially pp. 12 ff.

108. Gigliola Fragnito, *Vescovi e cardinali tra Chiesa e potere politico*, in “Società e storia”, no. 41 (1988), pp. 641-53, especially pp. 646-47; Id., “Parenti” e “familiari” nelle corti *cardinalizie del Rinascimento*, in Cesare Mozzarelli (eds.), “Familia” del principe e *famiglia aristocratica*, 2 vols., Bulzoni, Roma 1988, vol. II, pp. 565-87, see p. 573; Id., *Cardinal’s Courts in Sixteenth Century Rome*, in “Journal of Modern History”, LXV (1993), pp. 26-56, especially pp. 43-44.

109. Curial documentation is of little help: for example, under the date 20 December 1551 it lists twelve *familiares* for Morone, as it does for all the other cardinals (BAV, Ruoli, 11, f. 239v), presumably referring to those who enjoyed particular tax exemptions.

110. Laurie Nussdorfer, *Masculine Hierarchies in Roman Ecclesiastical Households*, in “European Review of History”, XXII (2015), pp. 620-42.

111. Peter Partner, *Renaissance Rome 1500-1559. A Portrait of a Society*, University of California Press, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1976, p. 138; Barbara McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals, Reform, and the Church as Property, 1492-1563*, University of California Press, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1985; P. Hurtubise, Une familletémoin, cited above, p. 275; Mary Hollingsworth, *A Taste for Conspicuous Consumption. Cardinal Ippolito d’Este and his Wardrobe, 1555-1566*, in id. e Carol M. Richardson (eds.), *The Possessions of a Cardinal. Politics, Piety and Art 1450-1700*, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park 2010, pp. 132-52, see p. 133.

112. Gigliola Fragnito, *Le loisir lettré à la cour du cardinal (XVI e-XVII e siècle*), in Marc Fumaroli, Philippe-Joseph Salazar e Emmanuel Bury (eds.), *Le loisir lettré à l’âge classique*, Droz, Genève 1996, pp. 131-47.

113. See, merely by way of example, Andrea Gáldy, Lost in Antiquities: Cardinal Giovanni de’ *Medici (1543-1562*), in M. Hollingsworth and C. M. Richardson, eds., *The Possessions of a Cardinal*, cited above, pp. 153-65. On Federico Cesi’s celebrated antiquarian collection, see Domenico Gnoli, *Il giardino e l’antiquario del cardinal Cesi*, in “Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts,” XX (1905), pp. 257-76; Claudio Franzoni, “Rimembranze d’infinite cose.” Le collezioni rinascimentali di antichità, in Salvatore Settis, ed., *Memoria dell’antico nell’arte italiana*, 3 vols., Einaudi, Turin 1984-86, vol. I, pp. 299-360, especially pp. 328-31; on the collection of the cardinal of Carpi, see Claudio Franzoni, ed., *Gli inventari dell’eredità del cardinale Rodolfo Pio da* Carpi, ETS, Pisa 2002.

114. Pauli Cortesii, *In libros de cardinalatu ad Iulium secundum pontificem maximum prooemium*, Symeon Nicolai Nardi alias Rufus calchographus imprimebat in Castro Cortesio 1510, pp. LVI-LVII. On him, see Nicoletta Pellegrino, *Nascita di una* “burocrazia.” Il cardinale nella trattatistica del XVI secolo, in C. Mozzarelli, ed., “Familia” del principe e *famiglia aristocratica*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 631-77, especially pp. 633 ff.; Enrica Guerra, Il “De cardinalatu” di Paolo Cortesi, in Antonella Cagnolati, ed., *La formazione delle élites in Europa dal Rinascimento alla Restaurazione*, introduction by Paolo Carile, Aracne, Rome 2012, pp. 85-98; Gigliola Fragnito, La *trattatistica cinque e seicentesca sulla corte cardinalizia*, in “Annali dell’istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento,” XVII (1991), pp. 135-85; and Carlo Dionisotti’s still fundamental pages, *Chierici e laici*, in idem, *Geografia e storia*, cited above, pp. 47-73, especially pp. 66 ff.

115. P. Cortesii, *In libros de cardinalatu*, cited above, p. XLVII .

116. A. V. Antonovics, *Counter-Reformation Cardinals, 1534-1590*, in “European Studies Review,” II (1972), pp. 301-27, 322-23; C. Robertson, “Il Gran Cardinale,” cited above, p. 11. On Ippolito d’Este, see Heinrich Lutz, *Kardinal Ippolito II. D’Este (1509-1572*). *Biographische Skizze eines weltliches Kirchenfürsten*, in Erwin Iserloh and Konrad Repgen, eds., *Reformata reformanda. Festgabe für Hubert*

Jedin zum 17. Juni 1965, 2 vols., Aschendorff, Münster Westf. 1965, pp. 508-30; M. Hollingsworth, *A Taste for Conspicuous Consumption*, cited above, p. 133. On the revenues of the archbishopric of Bologna, see Paolo Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597*), 2 vols., Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1959-67, vol. II, p. 304.

117. A. V. Antonovics, *Counter-Reformation Cardinals*, cited above, p. 323.

118. P. Partner, *Renaissance Rome*, cited above, p. 134.

119. Lucinda Byatt, "Una suprema magnificenza". Niccolò Ridolfi, a Florentine Cardinal in *Sixteenth-Century Rome*, Thesis discussed at the European University Institute, 1983, pp. 197-98, 327-31.

120. Ludovico Ariosto, Satire, II, 232-34 (in Opere, ed. by Cesare Segre, Einaudi, Torino 1987, p. 20).

121. David S. Chambers, *The Economic Predicament of Renaissance Cardinals*, in Studies *in Medieval and Renaissance History*, vol. III, ed. by William M. Bowski, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln 1966, pp. 287-313, see p. 290.

122. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

123. See above, section II.6.

124. During his lifetime, however, the Milanese cardinal was able to enjoy the house and garden of the Trastevere basilica, having obtained that right as compensation for restoration work and improvements that had cost him 5,000 or 6,000 scudi, as appears from a letter of Cardinal Granvelle of 24 August 1578 (*Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle, 1565-1586*, ed. Edmond Poullet and Charles Piot, 12 vols., F. Hayez, Brussels 1877-96, vol. VII, p. 123).

125. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, tav. iv; G. van Gulik e C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, cited above, vol. III, p. 27.

126. See below, section X.4.

127. Thomas F. Mayer, *Cardinal Pole's Finances*: The Property of a Reformer, in Mayer's collection of studies *Cardinal Pole in European Context*, cited above, pp. (XV) 1-16, especially p. 4.

128. B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above, p. 60.

129. Giovan Battista De Luca, *Il dottor volgare ovvero Il compendio di tutta la legge civile, canonica, feudale e municipale*, 4 vols., Società tipografica, Firenze 1839-43 [orig. ed. 1672], vol. IV, p. 491.

130. P. Partner, *Renaissance Rome*, cited above, pp. 136-37; Adriano Prosperi, *La figura del vescovo fra Quattro e Cinquecento: persistenze, disagi e novità*, in *Storia d'Italia. Annali 9. La Chiesa e il potere politico dal Medioevo all'età contemporanea*, ed. by Giorgio Chittolini e Giovanni Miccoli, Einaudi, Torino 1986, pp. 217-62, especially p. 227.

131. See, for example, the power of attorney issued by Morone to the bishop of Terracina, Ottaviano Raverta, and others on 25 November 1560 concerning a Spanish benefice (MiAGS, XLI. E. 7); or the receipt given to his sister Anna Morone Stampa on 26 October of that year for income she had collected "on the Riviera of Orte," perhaps a legacy of his Novara episcopate (ibid., XLI. E. 8).

132. See below, section XXIII.3.

133. See the two receipts for payment to the order's procurator general signed by Morone on 19 January and 5 July 1566 (MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, f. 1r).

134. Mario Rosa, *La curia romana nell'età moderna. Istituzioni, cultura, carriere*, Viella, Rome 2013, pp. 44-48; Wolfgang Reinhard, *Kardinalseinkünfte und Kirchenreform*, in "Römische Quartalschrift," LXXVII (1982), pp. 157-94; by the same author, see also *Struttura e significato del Sacro Collegio tra la fine del XV e la fine del XVI secolo*, in *Città italiane del '500 tra Riforma e Controriforma*, Proceedings of the conference (Lucca, 13-15 October 1983), M. Pacini Fazzi, Lucca 1988, pp. 257-81, especially pp. 261-62; G. Fragnito, *Vescovi e cardinali*, cited above; specifically on Morone, see B. McClung Hallman, *Italian*

Cardinals, cited above, pp. 57, 62-63, 106-8, who places him among the high prelates who regarded ecclesiastical benefices as mere sources of financial revenue; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 89.

135. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 343; see vol. I, pp. 90-91.

136. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 704-5.

137. NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 35, under 3 July 1553.

138. PM, vol. II, pp. 1111, 1115; see supra, section IX.3.

139. CT, vol. XI, p. 619; see infra, section XI.1.

140. When in 1552 the Venetian government considered abolishing the tax exemptions of high prelates, it was calculated that, in the case of Morone's Vicenza pension, the exemption was worth 100 ducats, as Nuncio Beccadelli wrote to Rome on 17 September (NV, vol. VI, pp. 151, 154).

141. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2 (*Heredità del signor cardinal Morone*); see M. Firpo e G. Maifreda, *Vivere (e morire) da cardinale*, cited above, p. 21.

142. See Morone's letter of thanks, with an analogous letter (now missing) to Charles V enclosed, sent from Sutri on 29 June 1550 to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, to whom he wrote shortly afterward, on 12 September, to express condolences on his father's death (MaBNE, 7911/86, 88; two letters of recommendation to Monsignor d'Arras, of 28 March and 2 September 1552, are ibid., 7911/89, 90).

143. Morone referred to that pension on 29 June 1550 when he informed Beccadelli of the "provision made by the emperor for many members of the college, among whom the most reverend Monsignor Pole received two thousand ducats and I one thousand" (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1).

144. On 11 June Morone wrote to Beccadelli, then papal nuncio in Venice, where the newly appointed titular bishop of Vicenza, the Dominican Angelo Bragadin, was then staying, asking him to present the "bulls and powers of attorney" to the bishop and urge him to pay the pension as soon as possible. The subsequent letter of 29 June shows that the bishop requested and obtained a postponement until Christmas; see also the later letter of 22 November. Yet on 4 June and 22 December 1552 the cardinal still had to press for payment of the half-yearly installments owed to him (ibid.; see also the subsequent letters).

145. G. van Gulik e C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, cited above, vol. III, p. 143, note 11 (Burgos; see CT, vol. II, pp. 179-80); p. 203, note 8 (Jaén); p. 133, note 13 (Bergamo); p. 333, note 5 (Vicenza; see CT, vol. II, p. 160); p. 252, note 7 (Modena).

146. SAG, Estado, 881, no. 2.

147. Ibid., 880, no. 126, minuta.

148. G. van Gulik and C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 181, note 7 (Cremona), and 260, note 9 (Novara); see also Girolamo Dandini's letter to Ferrante Gonzaga of 28 March 1551 (MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, *Dandini Girolamo*) and *La Novara sacra del vescovo venerabile Carlo Bescapè*, translated into Italian with annotations and a life of the author by Giuseppe Ravizza, Francesco Merati, Novara 1878, p. 9.

149. We cannot determine what was meant by a brief of Julius III dated 6 March 1552, listed in the inventory of the Medici di Marignano private archive, "which confers on Cardinals Giovanni Morone and Gian Angelo de' Medici certain commendams with a total income of 3,000 ducats" (Milan, Soprintendenza Archivistica e bibliografica della Lombardia, X.2).

150. B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above, p. 62.

151. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [3]r.

152. See below, section XXVII.2.

153. See the inventory of account books and miscellaneous family documents preserved at MnAS, *Archivio Casati Stampa*, reg. 311, f. 23rv. It is possible that Morone's purchases of precious stones ("pearls,

diamonds, and rubies"), ordered in Lisbon in December 1579, were connected with these property arrangements and the investment of the resulting liquid assets (BAV, *Vat. lat*., 6406, f. 149r).

154. B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above, p. 104.

155. See the case of the substantial rewards—benefices, canonries, and even the collectorship of Spain, which had recently fallen vacant—obtained by Cardinal Ludovico Madruzzo's principal collaborators after his legation to the Diet of Augsburg in 1582. On that occasion the cardinal received from the pope an initial sum of 2,000 scudi and a monthly stipend of 1,000 scudi, twice the amount normally paid to legates (Severino Vareschi, La *legazione del cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo alla dieta imperiale di Augusta del 1582*. *Chiesa, papato e Impero nella seconda metà del secolo XVI*, Società di studi trentini di scienze storiche, Trent 1990, pp. 310-14).

156. *Aspetti della riforma cattolica e del concilio di Trento. Mostra documentaria*, Catalogo ed. by Edvige Aleandri Barletta, Archivio di Stato di Roma, Roma 1964, pp. 119, 122.

157. FiAS, Mediceo, 3082, f. 445r; VeAS, *Senato. Ambasciatori. Roma*, 12, f. 76r.

158. NB3, vol. VI, p. 48.

159. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [45]r, [46]rv; ibid., XLI. E. 6, *Quitanze del signor cardinale Giovanni Morone verso il signor conte Sforza suo fratello sopra l'amministrazione da esso tenuta de' beni abaziali di Cagnano, diocesi tortonese (1559-1578*).

160. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, tav. i.

161. T. F. Mayer, *Cardinal Pole's Finances*, cited above, pp. 8-9.

162. Zygmunt Waźbiński, *Il cardinale Francesco Maria Del Monte 1549-1626*, 2 vols., Olschki, Firenze 1994, vol. I, p. 112.

163. A. Edith Hewett, *An Assessment of Italian Benefices held by the Cardinals for the Turkish War of 1571*, in "The English Historical Review", XXX (1915), pp. 488-501.

164. See below, section XXIV.1.

165. See in general the well-documented study by B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above.

166. See above, section V.1.

167. M. Firpo, "Amorbato delle cose lutherane" o "fidei catholicae propugnator"?, cited above

168. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 492.

XI. "To Remedy All the Disorders of the Priests": The Novara Episcopate and Don Lorenzo Davidico

1. CT, vol. II, pp. 168-69; with regard to Morone, see ibid., vol. XI, p. 552, note 2.

2. JEDIN , vol. III, pp. 305 ff.

3. On 1 October 1551 Ippolito Capilupi wrote from Rome that "[the pope] was always firmly resolved that no legate should go to the emperor, but as a counterweight to the one who was to go to France, he thought it appropriate to name another for the emperor; yet he certainly never intended that he should go. Indeed, he thought of appointing Morone, but because he understood that Morone was unwell, he did not wish to nominate him, lest people say that he was appointing sick men" (NB1, vol. XII, p. 70).

4. P. GIOVIO , Lettere, cited above, vol. II, pp. 218, 225; see pp. 219, 222-23.

5. PM, vol. II, pp. 636-42; a manuscript copy of the brief is in NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 34.

6. See below, section XIII.1.

7. MaBNE, 7911/91, letter to Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle of 30 September 1552. On 22 May 1552 Morone was in Milan, from where he wrote to Ferrante Gonzaga to recommend Bernardo Lesmo, formerly his father's "master of the household" (MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30), as he would also do with Granvelle on 18 October (MaBNE, 7911/93).

8. P. GIOVIO , Lettere, cited above, vol. II, p. 244.

9. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, letter of 27 September 1552. A few weeks later, on 3 January 1553, Ercole Gonzaga reminded his brother that he had always "desired that we might gratify and bind to us one of these most reverend cardinals, and especially the most reverend Morone, who is so much our friend, so worthy a man, as Your Excellency yourself has written to me, and so devoted a servant of His Majesty; and therefore, since we now have the means to do so, it seems to me that Your Excellency should not lose so fine an opportunity to show at least your desire and readiness to do what you can" (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1925).

10. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, letter of 27 settembre 1552.

11. MaBNE, 7911/91; see ibid., 92, the draft of Granvelle's reply. The cardinal renewed his request on 31 October, drawing attention to the "great urgency of the business" (ibid., 94). On the same day he also informed Ercole Gonzaga that he was awaiting the placet (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1922, f. 493r).

12. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30; on 28 and again on 30 November 1552 Morone also thanked Granvelle (MaBNE, 7911/95 and 96; see also ibid., 97, a letter of recommendation, and finally the letter of 23 December, by then from Novara, in which he informed him that the new fortifications were almost complete [ibid., 98]).

13. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 282, note 1, 283, note 1.

14. NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 34; see the letter sent on 27 November by the general economo of Milan, Marcantonio Patanella, to the deputy economo of Novara, *Giovanni Maria* Cicogna (ibid.).

15. PM, vol. II, pp. 127-28.

16. MaBNE, 7911/98.

17. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 6502, f. 23v.

18. In May 1557 the Modenese canon Domenico Morando, a close collaborator of Morone and himself then on trial before the Roman Holy Office, would say that "in 1552, as I believe, the cardinal went to Milan and Novara to take possession of the bishopric of Novara. In 1553 the cardinal returned to Rome and left me in Novara to look after the revenues of the bishopric and temporal jurisdiction, because in spiritual matters there was the vicar, Messer Giorgio Paravicino of Como; and I remained there until His Most Reverend Lordship was sent by Julius III as legate to the Diet of Augsburg" (PM, vol. I, pp. 1193-94; see p. 1264). Morone's presence in Novara in December 1552 is documented by an act dated the eleventh of that month (NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 34).

19. PM, vol. I, p. 718.

20. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 673-84 (incorrectly dated 1554). On these provisions, and more generally on Morone's reforming activity, see Pier Giorgio Longo, *Problemi di vita religiosa nella diocesi di Novara, prima dell'episcopato di Carlo Bascapè (1593) e con particolare riferimento al periodo 1580-1590*, undergraduate thesis, Faculty of Letters and Philosophy, University of Turin, academic year 1969-70, especially pp. 150 ff.; by the same author, see also *Letteratura e pietà a Novara tra XV e XVI secolo*, Associazione di storia della Chiesa novarese - Fondazione Achille Marazza, Novara-Borgomanero 1986; and in general F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 231 ff.

21. See supra, note al cap. XIV .

22. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1, which preserves several letters sent by Morone to Beccadelli during the months he spent in the diocese of Novara.

23. Ivi; see PM, vol. I, p. 1200; vol. III, p. 438.

24. NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 34. On Parisetto, see Processo Morone, vol. II, p. 520, note 26.

25. The act of appointment—which, among other things, entrusted Parravicino with the task of eliminating every kind of abuse and proceeding against anyone suspected of heresy—is in NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 35, ff. 60r-63v. On him, who would remain in office until January 1556, when he was replaced by Girolamo Gallarati, the Milanese cardinal's nephew (ibid., minutario 37, ff. 515r-519v), see PM, vol. I, p. 1193, note 10.

26. PM, vol. I, p. 1200.

27. Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae*, cited above, vol. V, pp. 262-63, letter of 29 July 1553. On the dispatch of the Jesuits to Corsica, see Roberto Moresco, *1552 – Silvestro Landini e Emanuele Gomez de Montemayor: due gesuiti a Capraia nel Cinquecento*, published on 27 June 2013 at www.storiaisoladicapraia.it. On the Society's role in ransoming Christians held captive in Islamic lands, a useful starting point is Giovanna Fiume, *Schiavitú mediterranee. Corsari, rinnegati e santi di età moderna*, Bruno Mondadori, Milan 2009.

28. See above, section I.3.

29. See below, section XIII.3; e il fondamentale studio di E. Bonora, *I conflitti della Controriforma*, cited above

30. AGB, *Atti capitolari*, vol. IV, f. 16r.

31. On him, we refer once and for all to M. Firpo, *Nel labirinto del mondo*, cited above.

32. Orazio Premoli, *Le lettere e lo spirito religioso di S. Antonio Maria Zaccaria*, Desclée & C., Roma 1909, p. 40.

33. AGB, *Atti capitolari*, vol. II, f. 8rv.

34. Ibid., f. 31v.

35. PM, vol. I, p. 47.

36. Lorenzo Davidico, *Trattato della communione induttivo a frequentar quella, intitolato Fiamma d'amor divino*, s. t., in Firenze 1550, p. 1r.

37. E. Bonora, *I conflitti della Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 475 ff.

38. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 123-24; see also pp. 222-23.

39. *Epistolae mixtae ex variis Europae locis ab anno 1537 ad 1556 scriptae*, 5 vols., Augustinus Avrial, Madrid 1898-1901, vol. II, pp. 870-72; see also pp. 832-33, the letter of 19 December in which Mercuriano reported the "great credit in this city" enjoyed by Davidico.

40. *Processi Davidico*, p. 123.

41. PM, vol. I, p. 1200; see *Processi Davidico*, p. 95.

42. Lorenzo Davidico, *Candore della catholica verità*, per Valerio Dorico et Luigi fratelli bressani, ad instantia de Vincenzo Luchino, Rome 1553, pp. 3-5; see *Processi Davidico*, pp. 107-9.

43. See the testimony against the Milanese cardinal given on 15 July 1555 by the inquisitor of Perugia, Matteo Lachi, who had occasion to associate with Davidico both on the eve of the latter's departure for Novara and shortly after that brief and unhappy experience had ended (PM, vol. I, p. 151; see *Processi Davidico*, pp. 369-72).

44. *Processi Davidico*, p. 124.

45. PM, vol. I, p. 1200.

46. Ibid., p. 1201.

47. NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553; see P. G. Longo, *Problemi di vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 156, note 1. At first Davidico thought Morone intended to employ him "only in the office of preaching, […] giving me some provision for my livelihood. And shortly after I arrived, he appointed me visitor and vicar forane" (*Processi Davidico*, p. 124).

48. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 3, 48; see p. 99.

49. PM, vol. I, p. 151.

50. "Of his own accord he promised to make me a suffragan bishop; against my will he made me vicar forane; he appointed me visitor with very great authority," Davidico would state in October 1555 (*Processi Davidico*, p. 109; see also pp. 135-36).

51. PM, vol. I, p. 1201; the conversation reportedly continued as follows: "He answered me, 'You say this to me? I have renounced the world and profess continence and chastity.'"

52. *Processi Davidico*, p. 79.

53. NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553.

54. Morone wrote to him there from Cusago on 16 June (*Processi Davidico*, pp. 25-26).

55. Ibid., p. 95.

56. Ibid., p. 63.

57. Ibid., p. 100.

58. Ibid., pp. 8, 95, 98-99, 128; see also pp. 62, 95.

59. Ibid., pp. 33 ff., 37-38, 75. The act summoning the chapter for 13 July on the Island of San Giulio—in which, as in other edicts he signed during these weeks, Davidico styled himself doctor of theology—was addressed to the clergy of Omegna, Valle Strona, Riviera d'Orta, Gozzano, and neighboring localities, and is in NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553.

60. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 6, 9, 37-39.

61. Ibid., pp. 22, 62; see pp. 42, 64.

62. Ibid., pp. 6, 8-9, 11-13, 32, 64, 79-81.

63. Ibid., pp. 7, 9, 12-14, 22, 39, 42, 48, 62.

64. Ibid., pp. 9, 40, 49, 54-55; see pp. 12, 63-64.

65. Ibid., pp. 15-16, 55, 60-61. In answering such charges, Davidico would accuse "the priests of the Cathedral" of having "wanted to feast under my protection," while insisting that he had almost always eaten alone and at his own expense, also "for fear of being poisoned" (ibid., p. 61).

66. Ibid., pp. 79-80; see also le pp. ff.

67. Ibid., pp. 32-35, 44, 58-59, 63-64.

68. Ibid., p. 35.

69. Ibid., pp. 6-9, 13-17, 20-22, 25 ff., 30, 33 ff., 46, 52-55, 54 ff., 58 ff., 63.

70. Ibid., p. 21; see pp. 26-27.

71. PM, vol. I, pp. 1201-2; see *Processi Davidico*, p. 98.

72. See the letters he sent to Beccadelli from Cusago on 8 July, from Milan on the fifteenth, and again from Cusago on the twenty-sixth, in which he said he was "about to leave for Rome within eight or ten days"; yet he was still there on 6 September, though by then ready to depart within a few days (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1).

73. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 3-4, 163.

74. In NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553, together with a copy of this edict, is preserved the letter in which Morone ordered Prepositi to proceed with the investigation.

75. For what follows as well, see *Processi Davidico*, pp. XXV ff.

76. Ibid., pp. 61-63.

77. On 4 September Morone appointed him parish priest of San Bartolomeo at Borgolavezzaro (NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 35, which also contains the acts conferring other minor benefices on Morando; see also minutario 36), and subsequently, in August 1555, canon of Santa Maria Maggiore (ibid., minutario 37, ff. 261r-262v).

78. See the letter sent to him by Prepositi on 9 August (NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553).

79. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 66 ff.

80. Ibid., pp. 71, 91.

81. Ibid., pp. 77-78. Later too, at a moment of great difficulty, imprisoned by the Roman Holy Office and fearful that his rash polemics with Morone might worsen his position, Davidico would admit his own responsibility (ibid., pp. 162-63).

82. See ibid., pp. 72-73, 79-81.

83. NoASD, Acta curiae, 1553.

84. PM, vol. II, pp. 664-69.

85. See ibid., vol. I, p. 444; see also p. 621. “As for Master Lorenzo Davidico,” the Jesuit Everardo Mercuriano wrote from Rome to Perugia on 7 October 1553, “I do not know whether Your Reverence will have received news. Here a cardinal who knew him well said that they had sent him to the galleys for certain offenses, among them granting absolutions—for which he had no authority—in exchange for money. We later learned that the report about the galleys was not true, but that Cardinal Morone made restitution on his behalf of a great deal of money, taking what he found on him and supplying the rest from his own purse, and that he did not punish him otherwise than by banishing him from his diocese. It is true that, so far as I know, there is no dispute about the offenses” (Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae*, cited above, vol. V, p. 553; see J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. III, p. 51).

86. *Processi Davidico*, p. 83.

87. Ibid., pp. 138-39; see also p. 146.

88. Ibid., pp. 221-24.

89. Ibid., p. 146.

90. PM, vol. II, pp. 822-23; see also pp. 184-85.

91. Ibid., vol. I, p. 150; see pp. 41-48.

92. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 145-46.

93. PM, vol. I, p. 151.

94. Ibid., p. 43.

95. Ibid., p. 151; see *Processi Davidico*, pp. 119 ff., 124 ff., 136. In the *confessio* written in prison immediately after his arrest, Morone himself recalled his meeting with the priest from Vercelli: “While speaking with him I simply said, ‘I am glad that recourse is had to the saints, but I feel some greater satisfaction, I know not what, when I have recourse to Christ and pour out my heart to him.’ He charged me with this” (PM, vol. I, p. 458). In October 1557 a rumor circulated in Mantua that the inquisitors “also charge Morone with having ordered Davidico to preach certain Lutheran articles” (ibid., vol. III, p. 186). See also *Processi Davidico*, pp. 108-9, 120 ff., for what the former Barnabite would later declare during the Roman trial.

96. PM, vol. I, pp. 151-52; see also pp. 596, 621.

97. *Processi Davidico*, pp. 107 ff., 124-25.

98. PM, vol. I, p. 152.

99. *Processi Davidico*, p. 110; see also p. 135.

100. Morone had already returned to Rome by early November, as appears from the letter he addressed to Pole on the ninth, in which he stressed that his return to the curia had "various causes and reasons, pertaining both to the government of the Church of Novara and to other matters of importance" (NB1, vol. XV, p. 87).

101. *Processi Davidico*, p. 102.

102. PM, vol. I, p. 153. In 1550 Davidico had dedicated to the cardinal inquisitors Il *vittorioso trionfo di Maria Vergine contra luterani*, then published in Florence.

103. See below, section XII.1.

104. See below, section XVI.3.

105. PM, vol. II, pp. 685-98.

106. Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, *La Prédication ecclésiastique d'après le cardinal Marcel Cervin et d'après les Exercises spirituels de saint Ignace*, in "Collection de la Bibliothèque des Exercises de saint Ignace," LXI-LXII (1920), pp. 160-65. The text was also published by S. Giombi, *Un ecclesiastico tridentino*, cited above, pp. 357-61. Expanded by a long introductory paragraph, it entered the draft of a *Bulla facienda ut provideatur malis praedicatoribus*, published ibid., pp. 351-56, and in CT, vol. XII, pp. 573-76. See William V. Hudon, *Two Instructions for Preachers from the Tridentine Reformation*, in "The Sixteenth Century Journal," XX (1989), pp. 457-70, especially pp. 461 ff.; also idem, *Marcello Cervini*, cited above, pp. 114 ff.; C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 350-52.

107. In 1560 a defense witness would state that Morone "drew up certain instructions which he discussed with the man who later became Pope Marcellus, then a cardinal, […] and which, he said, the most reverend Cardinal Morone intended to send to Novara" (PM, vol. II, pp. 808-9); another declared that he had "seen the original of the said method of preaching annotated by Cardinal Santa Croce" (ibid., pp. 936-37). For a different interpretation, see William V. Hudon, *Papal, Episcopal and Secular Authority in the Work of Marcello Cervini*, in "Cristianesimo nella storia," IX (1988), pp. 493-521.

108. PM, vol. II, p. 302.

109. See above, section VIII.4.

110. See above, sections IX.1-2.

111. See the letter addressed by Ercole Gonzaga to his brother that same day (MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, *Gonzaga Ercole*).

112. The letter is included as an appendix to Massimo Carlo Giannini, "Per beneficio della Città e Religione." Governo politico e Inquisizione nello Stato di Milano a metà Cinquecento, in *L'Italia di Carlo V*, cited above, pp. 303-36.

113. NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 35, f. 216r; minutario 36, f. 169r.

114. PM, vol. II, p. 941.

115. NoAS, *Notai. De Clapis Giovanni Maria*, minutario 35, f. 67rv.

116. PM, vol. II, pp. 702-5.

117. Ibid., p. 707; on him, see p. 127, note 25.

118. Ibid., pp. 670-71.

119. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, letter from Novara of 21 January 1553.

120. Ibid., letter from Novara of 8 August 1553.

121. Ibid., letter from Novara of 5 February 1553.

122. Ibid., letters from Milan of 24 February and from Cusago of 10 July 1553.

123. Ibid., letter from the Island of Orta of 13 May 1553.

124. Ibid., letter from Milan of 1 September 1553; see also ibid., the letter to Gonzaga of 3 September in which he took leave of him, inviting him to "consider whether I am good for rendering you any service wherever I may be," with the reply of 7 September enclosed, in which the governor of Milan concluded his customary thanks and greetings as follows: "I am writing to the governor of Novara so that he may take particular care of the rebuilding of another church in place of San Gaudenzio, which it was necessary to demolish for the fortification of that city." On the affair, see Massimo Carlo Giannini, *Per difesa comune*. Fisco, clero e comunità nello Stato di Milano (1535-1659), I. *Dalle guerre d'Italia alla pax hispanica (1535-1592*), Sette città, Viterbo 2017, pp. 233 ff., 306.

125. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, letter from Rome of 28 October 1551.

126. M. C. Giannini, *Per difesa comune*, cited above, pp. 205 ff.

127. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, letter from Rome of 17 November 1551.

128. MaBNE, 7911/90, 93, 96, 97, letters of 2 September, 18 October, 30 November, and 5 December 1552.

129. Ibid., letter of 10 November 1553.

130. Ibid., letter of 18 November 1553.

131. Ibid., letter of 25 April 1555.

132. Pole, *Epistolae*, vol. V, pp. 91-92.

133. PM, vol. II, pp. 151-52.

134. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 356, 464; Id., *Storia di Milano*, cited above, p. 173.

135. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30.

136. Ibid., *Comuni. Domodossola*.

137. FiAS, *Carte Cervini*, 46, ff. 19r, 165r; G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, pp. 211, note 2, 321.

138. PM, vol. II, pp. 643 ff.

139. Ibid., pp. 710-11.

140. Ibid., pp. 701-2.

141. Ibid., pp. 706-9.

142. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 434-35.

143. The document is published, with perceptive observations, by M. C. Giannini, "Per beneficio della Città e Religione," cited above, pp. 327-29 and note 64.

144. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 357 ff.; idem, *Storia di Milano*, cited above, pp. 367 ff.; see the documents published in the exhibition catalog *Vita religiosa a Cremona nel Cinquecento*, Archivio di Stato - Archivio della curia vescovile, Cremona 1985, pp. 127-28, especially pp. 359-73; Susanna Peyronel Rambaldi, *Inquisizione e potere laico: il caso di Cremona*, in P. C. Pissavino and G. Signorotto, eds., *Lombardia borromaica, Lombardia spagnola*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 579-617; Massimo Carlo Giannini, *La repressione dell'eresia nell'Italia di Carlo V: note su Ferrante Gonzaga e le Inquisizioni*, in Ferrante *Gonzaga. Il Mediterraneo, l'Impero (1507-1557*), Proceedings of the conference (*Guastalla*, 5-6 October 2007), ed. Gianvittorio Signorotto, Bulzoni, Rome 2009, pp. 259-93, especially pp. 278 ff.; idem, "Per beneficio della Città e Religione," cited above, pp. 317 ff., also on Morone's mediation between the Milanese Senate and the Roman Holy Office; and idem, Fra autonomia politica e ortodossia religiosa: il tentativo d'introdurre l'Inquisizione "al modo di Spagna" nello Stato di Milano (1558-1566), in "Società e

storia," XXIV (2001), no. 91, pp. 79-134, especially pp. 83 ff. On Gonzaga's religious outlook, see Massimo Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia nel Cinquecento*, 3 vols., Olschki, Florence 2003, vol. I, pp. 209 ff.

145. Mantova, BC, Carteggi, 4, *Capilupi Ippolito*, nos. 47, 54; see also n. 49; Dario Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia". Pietrantonio Di Capua tra valdesiani, "*spirituali*" e Inquisizione, Bibliopolis, Napoli 2003, pp. 55-56.

146. Virginia Panighetti, *L'ordine degli Umiliati nei decenni antecedenti la riforma di san* Carlo, in "Quaderni di Ambrosius," supplement to "Ambrosius," XL (1964), pp. 62-87, especially pp. 71 ff.; see pp. 79-83, two reports sent to Morone by the provost general Girolamo Torchio, who died in 1552. On the order, see M. P. Alberzoni, A. Ambrosioni, and A. Lucioni, eds., *Sulle tracce degli Umiliati*, cited above; Annamaria Ambrosioni, *Umiliate/Umiliati*, in *Dizionario degli Istituti di perfezione*, ed. Guerrino Pelliccia and Giancarlo Rocca, 10 vols., Paoline, Rome 1974-2003, vol. VI, cols. 1489-1507; idem, Gli *Umiliati. Punti fermi e spazi aperti*, in *Un monastero alle porte della città*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1999, pp. 113-28.

147. PM, vol. II, p. 1103.

148. Ibid., pp. 1133-34.

149. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, pp. 364-65.

150. Ibid., p. 367.

151. PM, vol. II, pp. 43-44.

152. Ibid., pp. 643-46.

153. Ibid., pp. 647-48, Chiarino's letter of 10 May 1553.

154. M. C. Giannini, "Per beneficio della Città e Religione," cited above, pp. 335-36. On 25 May, from the Island of San Giulio d'Orta, Morone informed Beccadelli that he intended to leave for Milan as soon as possible, "both for my own business and because of a commission received from Rome concerning certain persons under investigation at Cremona" (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1).

155. PM, vol. II, pp. 649-51.

156. Ibid., pp. 652-53.

157. Ibid., pp. 565-58.

158. See ibid., p. 659, letter from Rodolfo Pio da Carpi to Morone of 28 July 1553.

159. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 321.

160. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, ff. 6r-7r, letter of Ludovico Beccadelli, then nuncio in Venice, to Cardinal Girolamo Verallo of 14 September 1550.

161. F. Chabod, *Storia di Milano*, cited above, p. 462.

162. PM, vol. III, pp. 660-61.

163. Ibid., pp. 662-63.

164. M. C. Giannini, "Per beneficio della Città e Religione", cited above, p. 331.

165. PM, vol. II, p. 1134.

166. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 370.

167. NB1, vol. XIII, pp. 34-35.

168. Giancarlo Bosio makes no mention of these Cremonese trials in *Tensioni religiose ed impulsi riformistici dall'inizio del sec. XV al concilio di Trento*, in *Storia religiosa della Lombardia. 6: Diocesi di Cremona*, ed. Adriano Caprioli, Antonio Rimoldi, and Luciano Vaccaro, La Scuola, Brescia 1998, pp. 121-68.

169. PM, vol. II, pp. 1105-6; see pp. 1132-33, 1141-42, 1145, 1149, 1153-54, 1157, 1160.

170. F. Chabod, *Lo Stato e la vita religiosa*, cited above, p. 313.

171. See above, section X.4.

172. PM, vol. II, pp. 1113-14; see pp. 1116-17, 1119-20, 1133, 1175.

173. Ibid., pp. 1163-64; see pp. 1178-79.

174. Ibid., p. 1175.

175. See above, section VII.1.

176. On 5 April 1553 Pietro Camaiani, nuncio at the Brussels court, wrote to Baldovino Del Monte, the brother of Julius III, that Don Diego *Hurtado de Mendoza* had told him "that His Majesty held Cardinal Morone and the cardinal of Fano [Pietro Bertano] in high esteem, regarding them as men of the greatest distinction" (NB1, vol. XIII, p. 219).

177. See below, section XII.3.

178. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1, letters to Beccadelli from Cusago of 26 August and 6 September 1553, in which he informed him of his imminent departure for Rome.

179. Ibid. Even after his appointment as archbishop of Ragusa in 1555 and his transfer to Dalmatia, Beccadelli would remain in epistolary contact with Morone until the latter's arrest at the end of May 1557, making him his principal Roman correspondent after Gualteruzzi (see ibid., 1010 and 1020/1, passim).

XII. A Pontiff "Continually Irritated against the Office of the Holy Inquisition"

1. See above, section X.1.

2. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. V ff.; see also pp. 48-49, 124; Pole's letter to Paul III is published in PM, vol. I, p. 223, note 61.

3. See above, section VII.2.

4. PM, vol. II, pp. 550-51. For what follows as well, see M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above.

5. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, p. 825, note 37.

6. On him, see ibid., vol. II, p. 407; PM, vol. I, p. 822, note 33.

7. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. 52, 54; on Ramírez, see Massimo Firpo, *Riforma della Chiesa ed eresie nell'età di Carlo V. Riflessi spagnoli in Italia*, now in idem, *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 91-108, especially p. 105.

8. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 60, f. 73r.

9. On him, see PM, vol. I, p. 69, note 30.

10. A. Borromeo, *Il dissenso religioso tra il clero italiano*, cited above, p. 470.

11. CT, vol. II, pp. 157, 209, 212, 216. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 146, confuses this commission with the congregation of the Holy Office; see NB1, vol. XVI, p. 6 and note 2, and likewise Hermann H. Schwedt, *Die Anfänge der Römischen Inquisition. Kardinäle und Konsultoren 1542 bis 1600*, Herder, Basel-Freiburg-Vienna 2013, p. 181. The frequently repeated claim that in 1550 Morone was appointed to the congregation of the Holy Office together with Pole, and that both left it the following year, is therefore inaccurate; see, for example, Paul F. Grendler, *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press, 1540-1605*, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ) 1977, p. 96.

12. FiAS, Mediceo, 3269, f. 361v. On the renewed convocation of the council, see Jedin, vol. III, pp. 307 ff.

13. CT, vol. II, p. 198; see A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 90.

14. B. Fontana, *Documenti vaticani contro l'eresia*, cited above, pp. 412-15; see E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 381-87, especially p. 385; G. Romeo, *L'Inquisizione nell'Italia moderna*, cited above, pp. 24-25.

15. NV, vol. V, pp. 101, 106; see p. 109; Lancillotti, vol. X, p. 272.

16. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. II, p. 72; see Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 179, 248, 458, 475-79, 483, 487-89, 532, 536-38, 540, 551, 567-68, 597, 616; in general, on Julius III's attitude toward the Jesuits, see Guido Mongini, *I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento tra crisi religiosa e Controriforma*, in M. Catto and C. Ferlan, eds., *I gesuiti e i papi*, cited above, pp. 19-51, especially pp. 35 ff.

17. See the letter of thanks sent to him by Loyola on 16 June 1550 (Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 89-90).

18. Ibid., vol. XII, p. 400.

19. Hieronymi Nadal, *Commentarii de instituto Societatis Iesu*, ed. by Michael Nicolau, apud Monumenta historica Societatis Iesu, Romae 1962, p. 649.

20. Joannis Alphonsi de Polanco, *Epistolae et commentaria* (*Polanci complementa*), 2 vols., typis Gabrielis López del Horno, Madrid 1916-17, vol. II, p. 775; see G. Mongini, *I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento*, cited above, p. 24; these problems receive no mention in J. W. O'Malley's broad but evasive synthesis, *I primi gesuiti*, cited above.

21. E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 475 ff.; Giovanni Romeo, Ricerche *su confessione dei peccati e Inquisizione nell'Italia del Cinquecento*, La Città del Sole, Napoli 1997, pp. 42 ff.; A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, p. 492, note 17.

22. Ibid., pp. 9 ff.; see Pierroberto Scaramella, *L'Inquisizione romana e i valdesi di Calabria (1554-1703*), Editoriale scientifica, Napoli 1999, pp. 90 ff.

23. Ignatii de Loyola, *Epistolae*, cited above, vol. III, p. 458. The conciliar interventions of the two Jesuits occupy the whole of CT, vol. VI; see P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesú*, cited above, vol. II/2, pp. 501 ff.

24. Carlo Ginzburg, *I costituti di don Pietro Manelfi*, Sansoni - The Newberry Library, Firenze-Chicago 1970; Aldo Stella, *Dall'anabattismo al socinianesimo nel Cinquecento veneto. Ricerche storiche*, Liviana, Padova 1967.

25. E. Garavelli, *Lodovico Domenichi*, cited above; M. Firpo, *Gli affreschi di Pontormo*, cited above, pp. 352 ff.

26. Pio Paschini, *Venezia e l'Inquisizione romana da Giulio III a Pio IV*, Antenore, Padova 1959, pp. 33 ff.

27. B. Fontana, *Documenti vaticani contro l'eresia*, cited above, p. 411.

28. P. Paschini, *Venezia e l'Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 42.

29. H. Bullinger, *Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 177, 189, 201.

30. Guido Dall'Olio, *La disciplina dei religiosi all'epoca del Concilio di Trento: sondaggi bolognesi*, in "Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento," XXI (1995), pp. 93-140; Silvana Seidel Menchi, *Origine e origini del Santo Uffizio dell'Inquisizione romana (1542-1559*), in *L'Inquisizione*, Proceedings of the international symposium (Vatican City, 29-31 October 1998), ed. Agostino Borromeo, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 2003, pp. 291-321, especially p. 300; A. Borromeo, *Il dissenso religioso tra il clero italiano*, cited above, pp. 471-72, 481 ff.

31. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 28v, 53v-54r; see Ludwig von Pastor, *Allgemeine Dekrete der Römischen Inquisition aus den Jahren 1555-1597*, Herdersche Verlagshandlung, Freiburg im Breisgau 1912, p. 61; Pastor, vol. VI, p. 148; S. Seidel Menchi, *Origine e origini*, cited above, p. 301; Pierroberto

scaramella, *Le lettere della congregazione del Sant'Ufficio ai tribunali di fede di Napoli 1563-1625*, Università di Trieste - Istituto italiano per gli studi filosofici, Trieste-Napoli 2002, p. XLVII ; G. Caravale, *Predicazione e Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 24-25.

32. Miguel Gotor, *Santi stravaganti. Agiografia, ordini religiosi e censura ecclesiastica nella prima età moderna*, Aracne, Roma 2012, pp. 122 ff.

33. ACDF, Stanza storica, L. 6-n, f. 1rv.

34. G. Romeo, *L'Inquisizione nell'Italia moderna*, cited above, p. 8; A. Del Col, *L'Inquisizione in* Italia, cited above, pp. 302 ff.

35. PM, vol. I, pp. 427-28; see supra, section III.5.

36. G. Dall'Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 57 ff.; see A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, p. 121; e supra, section VII.3.

37. See below, section XII.3.

38. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 2r, 8r (Vergerio); ff. 7v, 8v, 9r, 10rv, 11v, 13r, 16v (Nacchianti); ff. 79v, 84v, 85r, 86v, 89v, 101r, 106r (Verdura). For what follows as well, see A. Borromeo, *Il dissenso religioso tra il clero italiano*, cited above, pp. 474 ff.; C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 396 ff.

39. Jedin, vol. II, pp. 112, 220 ff.

40. CT, vol. I, pp. 816 ff.; P. Mozzato, *Jacopo Nacchianti*, cited above; G. Italiano, *La pastorale eterodossa*, cited above

41. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], *Historia di Francesco Spiera, il quale per havere in varii modi negata la conosciuta verità dell'evangelio cascò in una misera desperatione*, n.p. 1551, p. 42r.

42. See below, section XII.2.

43. See above, section VI.4.

44. M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, p. 431.

45. Ibid., p. 432.

46. On him, see Guido Dall'Olio, *Muzzarelli, Girolamo*, in DBI, vol. LXXVII, pp. 629-31; PM, vol. I, pp. 729-31; and Heinrich Lutz's introduction to NB1, vol. XIV, pp. XI ff.

47. PM, vol. I, pp. 732-33. In 1555 the cardinal of Carpi would confirm that "the Office of the Inquisition is forbidden to proceed against cardinals except by express commission of the pope" (M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 359, 364-66).

48. PM, vol. II, p. 1013.

49. Ibid., p. 1010.

50. Ibid., vol. I, p. 733; *Processi Soranzo*, vol. II, pp. 980-81.

51. See below, section XII.2.

52. On him, see Gigliola Fragnito, *Cicala, Giambattista*, in DBI, vol. XXV, pp. 304-9.

53. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 42r; his presence at the congregation's meetings is regularly attested from the beginning of 1550 (ibid., ff. 23r ff.).

54. On him, see Annalisa Antonucci, *Federici, Girolamo*, in DBI, vol. XLV, pp. 639-42; Alberto Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione, storiografia*, Le Lettere, Florence 1999, pp. 47 ff.; PM, vol. II, pp. 1003 ff.

55. CT, vol. II, p. 248; see pp. 534, 592.

56. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 242, note 2, e passim.

57. M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 464-65.

58. Ibid., pp. 438 ff.

59. Ibid., pp. 460 ff.

60. Ibid., pp. 433-34 and note 40, 464-65 and note 154.

61. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], *Sei dialogi ne' quali diffusamente si ragiona del concilio di* Trento, [Dolfino Landolfi, Poschiavo 1551], p. Avv.

62. On him, see Pio Paschini, *Giovanni Grimani accusato di eresia*, in idem, *Tre illustri prelati del Rinascimento. Ermolao Barbaro – Adriano Castellesi – Giovanni Grimani*, Lateranum, Rome 1907, pp. 131-96; Peter J. Laven, The "Causa" Grimani and Its *Political Overtones*, in "The Journal of Religious History," IV (1967), pp. 184-205; Massimo Firpo, Le ambiguità della porpora e i "diavoli" del Sant'Ufficio: identità e *storia nei ritratti di Giovanni Grimani*, in idem, *Storie di immagini*, cited above, pp. 119-71; Elena Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi. La definizione dei poteri nella Chiesa postridentina*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2007, pp. 64 ff.; Andrea Del Col, *Le vicende inquisitoriali di Giovanni Grimani, patriarca di Aquileia, e la sua lettera sulla doppia predestinazione*, in "Metodi e ricerche," XXVII (2008), pp. 81-100.

63. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, pp. 266-67.

64. NV, vol. VI, p. 311, Beccadelli's letter to Innocenzo Del Monte of 27 January 1554.

65. Giuseppe De Leva, *Giovanni Grimani patriarca d'Aquileia*, in "Atti del R. Istituto veneto di scienze lettere ed arti", serie V, VII (1881), pp. 407-54, especially pp. 452-54.

66. On him, with fuller bibliographical information, see PM, vol. I, p. 62, note 16; Andrea Gardi, *Pietro Antonio Di Capua (1513-1578). Primi elementi per una biografia*, in "Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa," XXIV (1988), pp. 262-310; and especially D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia," cited above.

67. Eduard Boehmer, *Le cento e dieci divine considerazioni di Giovanni Valdesso*, Guglielmo Ploetz, Halle in Sassonia 1860, pp. 600-1.

68. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 1230; see p. 1098.

69. Ibid., pp. 1116-17.

70. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 251.

71. See PM, vol. I, p. 62, nota.

72. CT, vol. XI, pp. 987-88; see p. 662; *Algunas cartas de don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza*, cited above, p. 284.

73. D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, pp. 21-22, 150-52.

74. *Cartas de Diego Hurtado de Mendoza al cardenal de Granvela (1548-1551*), [ed. Antonio Paz y Meliá], in "Revista de archivos bibliotecas y museos," III (1899), pp. 612-22, especially pp. 619-21.

75. PM, vol. II, p. 1008.

76. D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, p. 162.

77. Ibid., pp. 65 ff.

78. Ibid., pp. 84, 170-71.

79. Ibid., pp. 87-88, 177-81.

80. See, for example, Ercole Gonzaga's letter to Ippolito Capilupi of 3 January 1555, in which he still hoped for Di Capua's elevation to the cardinalate, "with the help, as you write, of the most reverend Monsignor Morone" (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1945, book III, ff. 11r-14r; see ibid., 1925, ff. 350r, 353r, 383rv; D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia," cited above, pp. 125, 238-39).

81. He wrote thus to Innocenzo Del Monte on 23 March 1554 (D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia," cited above, pp. 106-10).

82. D. Marcatto, “Questo passo dell’heresia,” cited above, pp. 112-13, 228-29; see also Capilupi’s letter to Gonzaga of 6 May 1554 (SAG, Estado, 881, no. 82).

83. See his memorial for the imperial court, dated Rome, 14 April 1552 (J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 192).

84. D. Marcatto, “Questo passo dell’heresia”, cited above, pp. 112-14.

85. Ibid., pp. 125-27, 239-41; to document these accusations, Julius III announced to Charles V that he would send a detailed summary of the trial.

86. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 97; see also pp. 272 ff.

87. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 79v; NV, vol. VI, pp. 162-63; see pp. 151, 155.

88. Alberto Aubert, Note su Giovan Francesco Verdura, vescovo “regnicolo”, e *l’Inquisizione romana (1552-1560*), in “Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia”, XXXIX (1985), pp. 109-17, especially p. 114.

89. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 84v, 85r, 86v, 89v, 101r, 106r.

90. A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, p. 137.

91. Paul Larivaille, *Pietro Aretino*, Salerno, Rome 1997, pp. 350 ff., especially p. 351; Christopher Cairns, *Pietro Aretino and the Republic of Venice. Researches on Aretino and* His Circle in Venice 1527-1556, Olschki, Florence 1985, pp. 179 ff.; Paolo Procaccioli, *Un cappello per il divino. Note sul miraggio cardinalesco di Pietro Aretino*, in Angelo Romano and Paolo Procaccioli, eds., *Studi sul Rinascimento italiano in memoria di Giovanni Aquilecchia*, Vecchiarelli, Manziana 2005, pp. 189-226, especially pp. 210 ff.

92. See above, section IV.2.

93. P. Lopez, *Il movimento valdesiano a Napoli*, cited above, p. 152.

94. SAG, Estado, 1038, no. 132; see 1039, nos. 53 e 98.

95. Ibid., 1040, no. 113; see n. 166; E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant’Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 441 ff.

96. Pier Luigi Bruzzone, *Papa collerico e stravagante*, in “La Cultura”, n. s. I (1891), pp. 432-36.

97. See below, section XV.4.

98. See above, section V.2.

99. D. Crews, *Twilight of Renaissance*, cited above, pp. 47 ff.

100. CT, vol. II, p. 160.

101. Ibid., vol. XI, pp. 549-50; see also pp. 560, 583; e *Algunas cartas de don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza*, cited above, p. 240.

102. CT, vol. XI, pp. 577-78; see also pp. 583, 977; particularly interesting from this perspective is the *Memoriale dato al signore Annibale Rucellai per Francia*, in Giovanni Della Casa, Opere, 4 vols., Società tipografica de’ classici italiani, Milan 1806, vol. IV, pp. 21 ff.

103. CT, vol. XI, p. 589; see p. 577; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 309.

104. CT, vol. XI, pp. 591-92; see also pp. 598, 603.

105. A. Caracciolo, *Vita et gesti di Giovan Pietro Carafa*, cited above, ff. 289v-290r. The phrase was taken from a ponderous polemical work by the Celestine Iacopo Moronessa of Lecce, published at Venice in 1556, *Il modello di Martino Lutero*. It opened with a preface by Rebiba himself praising the author for his “labors spent in confounding the iniquity of the new precursor of Antichrist,” the “pestilential Luther,” the “terrible monster of Saxony,” and rejoicing that “those stained with this black pitch” were being sent “by whole boatloads to Rome, the true touchstone” (Iacopo Moronessa, *Il modello di Martino Lutero*, appresso Gabriel Giolito de Ferrari et fratelli, Venice 1556, pp. [*vi]v-[*vii]r, 3, 361-62). A later note added to a document of the Neapolitan Inquisition of 1595 reported that “years ago the nuncio kept a boat for this

purpose, and the boatmen held warrants from this Holy Office" (Luigi Amabile, *Il Santo Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli*, 2 vols., S. Lapi, Città di Castello 1892, vol. I, pp. 214-15); for what follows as well, see ibid., pp. 142 ff.

106. See M. Firpo, *La presa di potere*, cited above, pp. 118 ff.; Pierroberto Scaramella, *I baroni meridionali e l'accusa di eresia. Presupposti ed esiti di una vicenda inquisitoriale*, in l. Felici (eds.), *Ripensare la riforma protestante*, cited above, pp. 137-56.

107. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 46r, 49v, 59r, 61v, 71r, 73r, 75r, 78r, 82v, 87r, 99v, 103r, 109rv, 116r. What survives of that trial is published in PM, vol. I, pp. 804 ff.

108. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 899.

109. *Processi Soranzo*, vol. I, p. 406; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Una gentildonna irrequieta*, cited above, pp. 161 ff.

110. PM, vol. I, p. 817.

111. Giulio Antonio Santoro, *De persecutionis haereticae pravitatis historia*, ACDF, Stanza storica, I 4-b, f. [3r]; on him, see Saverio Ricci, *Il sommo inquisitore. Giulio Antonio Santori tra autobiografia e storia (1532-1602*), Salerno, Rome 2002.

112. D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, pp. 72-75.

113. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1923, ff. 708r-711r; see m. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, p. 8; D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, p. 83.

114. Ibid., p. 166; see S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Una gentildonna irrequieta*, cited above, p. 18; see pp. 170 ff.

115. D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, p. 83.

116. Ibid., p. 65, note 181.

117. Ibid., pp. 177-76; see G. A. Santoro, *De persecutionis haereticae pravitatis historia*, cited above, f. [3r]: "Lady Giulia Gonzaga was also summoned to Rome, as they say, in these same days [December 1552] for this reason: she was presumed to be a heretic."

118. Giuseppe Coniglio, ed., *Il viceregno di don Pietro di Toledo (1532-1553*), 2 vols., Giannini, Naples 1984, vol. II, p. 697; on Toledo's religious policy, see Pasquale Lopez, *Inquisizione, stampa e censura nel regno di Napoli tra '500 e '600*, Edizioni del Delfino, Naples 1974, pp. 29 ff.; Carlos José Hernando Sánchez, *Castilla y Nápoles en el siglo XVI. El virrey Pedro de Toledo. Linaje, estado y cultura (1532-1553*), Junta de Castilla y Léon, Salamanca 1994, pp. 447 ff.

119. SAG, Estado, 1046, no. 23; see 1047, no. 221; D. Marcatto, "Questo passo dell'heresia", cited above, pp. 118-19 and note 389; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Una gentildonna irrequieta*, cited above, p. 174.

120. SAG, Estado, 1046, no. 38; see 1047, no. 39.

121. Ibid., 1045, nos. 44-45, 326-27.

122. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 131r.

123. VeAS, Sant'Uffizio, 19.

124. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 49, f. 192rv; see L. Amabile, *Il Santo Officio*, cited above, vol. I, p. 144, where Seripando's reply of 31 December is also published; CT, vol. II, pp. 443, 445; see S. Ricci, *Il sommo inquisitore*, cited above, pp. 58-59.

125. PM, vol. I, pp. 804 ff.

126. See above, sections V.2 and VII.1.

127. PM, vol. I, pp. 810, 821-23.

128. See above, section X.2.

129. F. Negri, Tragedia cited above, pp. [P8]r-Q[1]r.

130. Ibid., pp. [B6]v-[B7]r; see above, section V.3.

131. S. Pagano e C. Ranieri, Nuovi documenti cited above, pp. 25 ff.

132. PM, vol. II, pp. 16 ff.

133. See above, section X.2.

134. PM, vol. I, pp. 52-53.

135. See below, section XIV.2.

136. PM, vol. I, pp. 3 ff.; see below, section XIV.4

137. PM, vol. I, pp. 797 ff.

138. See below, section XIII.1.

139. PM, vol. I, pp. 1048 ff.

140. Ibid., pp. 1077 ff.

141. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 49v-71v, passim. Arrested at Faenza in September 1551, Flaminio was condemned at Rome in May of the following year (M. Flaminio, Apologia, cited above, p. 206, note 58; M. Firpo, *Vittore Soranzo*, cited above, pp. 236-37).

142. Processi Soranzo, vol. II, p. 615.

143. Ibid., p. 648.

144. L. Amabile, Il Santo officio cited above, vol. I, p. 143, note 2.

145. PM, vol. I, pp. 818, 827; see above, section V.4.

146. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 59r, 87r.

147. RoAS, Archivio del collegio dei notai capitolini, 1287, ff. 397r-398v, 429r-430v.

148. PM, vol. II, p. 1013.

149. Ibid., pp. 1013-14.

150. Ibid., p. 1017.

151. Ibid., pp. 1014-15; see Fabrizio Biferali and Massimo Firpo, Ancora su pittura ed eresia nel '500 italiano. Un'ipotesi su Girolamo Siciolante da Sermoneta, in Andrea Del Col and Anne Jacobson Schutte, eds., L'Inquisizione romana, i giudici e gli eretici. Studi in onore di John Tedeschi, Viella, Rome 2017, pp. 91-108, reprinted in idem, *Immagini ed eresie*, cited above, pp. 86 ff.

152. See above, section XII.3.

153. See above, section XII.2.

154. P. L. Bruzzone, Papa collerico e stravagante cited above, p. 434; see Pastor, vol. VI, p. 482.

XIII. “He Looked as Though He Wanted to Eat Him Alive.” The Spirituali on Trial.

1. See above, sections V.4 and VII.1.

2. PM, vol. I, pp. 657-58; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 277 ff.; Paolo Simoncelli, *Diplomazia e politica religiosa nella Chiesa della Controriforma*, in “Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa,” XIX (1982), pp. 415-60, and the uneasy reconstruction by A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 92 ff.

3. PM, vol. I, pp. 654-55.

4. Ibid., p. 660.

5. Ibid., p. 182; vol. II, pp. 1046-47.

6. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 56-57.

7. Carlo Brizzolari, L’Inquisizione a Genova e in Liguria, Erga, Genoa 1974, p. 71; ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 4v ff., 41v ff.

8. PM, vol. II, pp. 1021-22.

9. M. FIRPO, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 303-4.

10. id., Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 449 ff.; Id., Teologia, storia e politica nell’ultimo processo inquisitoriale di Pietro Carnesecchi (1566-67), in Id., “Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede” cited above, pp. 227-46.

11. PM, vol. I, pp. 87-90.

12. Ibid., pp. 83, 87; see p. 732, and above, section VII.3.

13. PM, vol. II, p. 1021.

14. Ibid., vol. I, p. 733.

15. A few years later Federici would draw a scornful portrait of the Florentine friar, recalling his “inconstancy,” “impiety,” and continual lies, and depicting him as a man “changeable, irresolute, and, to conclude, a beast.” Usodimare likewise judged him “a worthless, inconstant fellow” who “did not himself know what he was saying,” a madman whom he would gladly have imprisoned and subjected to a few turns of the rope “to teach him to tell the truth” (ibid., vol. II, pp. 1021-22; for other similar judgments by his confrères, see ibid., pp. 1047-49, 1052).

16. Ibid., pp. 1021-22.

17. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 298 ff.

18. PM, vol. I, pp. 718-19; see also pp. 95-96.

19. Ibid., p. 105; see also pp. 148-49. As another witness would report, shortly after the abjuration, at Bartoli’s own request, Morone gave him an alms of two scudi so that he could return to his convent (ibid., pp. 792-93). On 14 June 1552 Álvarez de Toledo “publicavit processum fratris Bertrandi [sic] cum termino” (ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 71r; see D. Marcatto, “Questo passo dell’heresia,” cited above, p. 70, note 205).

20. PM, vol. I, p. 661; see pp. 663-64, 668-69, 741-46.

21. Ibid., p. 733; see vol. II, p. 1020.

22. Ibid., vol. I, p. 733.

23. Ibid., pp. 3 ff.

24. Ibid., pp. 604-5, 633-34, 832-37; and pp. 734-35, 738, Muzzarelli’s deposition.

25. Ibid., pp. 436-37.

26. Ibid., p. 605. “I told His Holiness that I would remain most obliged to him,” he would conclude, “and I begged him to do it”; see vol. II, pp. 1018-19.

27. Monumenti di varia letteratura cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 347-53.

28. Ibid., pp. 347-48.

29. Ibid. (corsivo aggiunto).

30. G. Miccoli, La storia religiosa cited above, pp. 1061-66; D. Fenlon, Heresy and Obedience cited above, pp. 237 ff.; P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole cited above, pp. 81-85; C. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 417-20.

31. Monumenti di varia letteratura cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 349-50.

32. Ibid., p. 351.

33. Ibid., p. 352.

34. J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, Pole y Paulo IV cited above, p. 58.

35. PM, vol. I, pp. 588-90.

36. Ibid., pp. 26 ff.

37. G. Buschbell, *Reformation und Inquisition*, cited above, p. 320, Girolamo Vida’s letter to Marcello Cervini of 27 June 1553.

38. See below, section XV.4.; PM, vol. I, pp. 38 ff.

39. Pole, Epistolae, vol. IV, pp. 91-106, where the letter is incorrectly dated 6 August (see NB1, vol. XV, p. XIX, note 12). Heinrich Lutz’s hypothesis that the text published in the edition of the English cardinal’s correspondence differed at least in part from the letter actually sent is not accepted by Thomas F. Mayer, ed., The Correspondence of Reginald Pole, 4 vols., Ashgate, Aldershot 2002-2008, vol. II, pp. 138-58; see Massimo Firpo, Sulla legazione di pace di Reginald Pole (1553-1556), in “Rivista storica italiana,” XCIII (1981), pp. 821-37; P. Simoncelli, *Diplomazia e politica religiosa*, cited above, pp. 429 ff.

40. Pole, Epistolae, vol. I, pp. 101-3. Scullica had lived in Naples since 1537, where he taught logic and philosophy; in 1539 he had disputed “with biting and salty remarks” against a heterodox friar and gained a reputation as a “sanctae fidei contra haereticos validus et infractus propugnator.” After taking his degree at the Sorbonne, he returned to Italy and became a commissioner of the newly established Roman Inquisition (L. Amabile, *Il Santo Officio*, cited above, vol. I, p. 194; see NV, vol. V, pp. 51, 199, 221, 224; Ph. McNair, *Peter Martyr*, cited above, p. 37). Shortly before his death in June 1551, Fra Teofilo had drawn up another “information” against Loyola and “many other persons.” Niccolò Franco would speak of a denunciation he had lodged against Contarini, Pole, and Morone in his famous pasquinade against Paul IV (Angelo Mercati, I costituti di Niccolò Franco (1568-1570) dinanzi l’Inquisizione di Roma esistenti nell’Archivio segreto vaticano, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1955, p. 184).

41. Pole, Epistolae, vol. IV, p. 106.

42. Ibid., vol. V, pp. 122-28.

43. See the Spanish ambassador Juan Manrique de Lara’s letter to Charles V of 11 January 1554 (René Ancel, *La réconciliation de l’Angleterre avec le Sainte Siège sous Marie Tudor*, in “Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique,” X (1909), pp. 521-36, 744-98, especially p. 762).

44. SAG, Estado, 879, no. 102, letter to Charles V of 17 December 1553.

45. Ibid., no. 103. The Spanish ambassador also said that, in the matter of Di Capua’s cardinalate, no member of the Sacred College had been willing and able to help him except Morone, who was always “most devoted” to the emperor’s service.

46. Pole, Epistolae, vol. IV, p. 129; NB1, vol. XV, pp. 144-45; see M. Firpo, *Sulla legazione di pace di Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 821-37. At the time of Pole’s departure in December 1553, Julius III advised

him “ut fidem habeat litteris cardinalis Moroni” (R. Ancel, *La réconciliation*, cited above, p. 762); A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 91.

47. Pole, Epistolae, vol. IV, pp. 129-30, 134, 148; NB1, vol. XV, passim.

48. Pole, Epistolae, vol. IV, p. 171; vol. V, pp. 94, 109; see NB1, vol. XV, p. 331.

49. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, p. 150; see NB1, vol. XV, p. 183. On Vergerio’s polemic against Pole, see P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 108 ff.

50. NB1, vol. XV, p. 103.

51. Ibid., vol. XIV, pp. 238-39.

52. Ibid., p. XXVII.

53. Ibid., pp. 310-11.

54. Ibid., pp. 315-17.

55. PM, vol. II, pp. 1028-29.

56. NB1, vol. XIV, p. XXV.

57. Ibid., pp. 373-75.

58. NB1, vol. XIV, pp. 420-21; see A. Mercati, *I costituti di Niccolò Franco*, cited above, p. 184, where Muzzarelli is described as the man who “wanted to put the most illustrious Cardinal Carafa on trial”; Pietro Nores, *Storia della guerra di Paolo IV sommo pontefice contro gli spagnuoli*, in “Archivio storico italiano,” XII (1847), pp. 480-82.

59. “Yesterday morning the general of Saint Dominic passed to a better life; he was struck by apoplexy and died within seven hours,” the Florentine ambassador wrote on 22 July (FiAS, Mediceo, 3271, f. 295v).

60. The brief of appointment is in PM, vol. II, p. 699; see Stephen L. Forte, The Cardinal-Protector of the Dominican Order, S. Sabinae, Rome 1959, p. 74.

61. PM, vol. II, p. 1043; see ibid., p. 937.

62. Ibid., pp. 972-73, 1051.

63. Stefania Pastore, Il vangelo e la spada. L’Inquisizione di Castiglia e i suoi critici (1460-1598), Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2003, pp. 218 ff.

64. See Matteo Al Kalak, Trento o Ratisbona? Irenismo e istanze di conciliazione all’ombra di Gasparo Contarini, in M. Catto and A. Prosperi, eds., *Trent and Beyond*, cited above, pp. 267-86, especially pp. 270 ff., who emphasized the continuity of the irenic outlook of many Bolognese Dominicans, including in the positions they adopted at the council.

65. P. Giovio, Lettere cited above, vol. I, p. 312.

66. G. Dall’Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, pp. 59 ff.; Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. 4, 9. On him, in addition to Abele L. Redigonda, Alberti, Leandro, in DBI, vol. I, pp. 699-702, see Giancarlo Petrella, L’officina del geografo. La “Descrittione di tutta Italia” di Leandro Alberti e gli studi geografico-antiquari tra Quattro e Cinquecento, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 2004; idem, Nella cella di fra’ Leandro. Prime ricerche sui libri di Leandro Alberti umanista e inquisitore, in Edoardo Barbieri and Danilo Zardin, eds., Libri, biblioteche e cultura nell’Italia del Cinque e Seicento, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 2002, pp. 86-135; Adriano Prosperi, Leandro Alberti inquisitore di Bologna e storico dell’Italia, introduction to Leandro Alberti, Descrittione di tutta Italia (facsimile reprint of the 1568 Venetian edition), Leading, Bergamo 2003, pp. 7-26, now in Prosperi’s collection Eresie e devozioni. La religione italiana in età moderna, 3 vols., Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2010, vol. II, pp. 313-36; and L’Italia dell’inquisitore. Storia e geografia dell’Italia del Cinquecento nella “Descrittione” di Leandro Alberti, proceedings of the conference (Bologna, 27-29 May 2004), edited by Massimo Donattini, Bononia University Press, Bologna 2007.

67. C. Ginzburg, I costituti cited above, p. 31.

68. See above, section XII.2.

69. F. Valenti, Il carteggio di padre Girolamo Papino cited above, p. 314; see Bartolommeo Fontana, Renata di Francia duchessa di Ferrara: sui documenti dell'Archivio estense, del mediceo, del Gonzaga e dell'Archivio secreto vaticano, 3 vols., Forzani e C., Rome 1889-99, vol. II, p. 231; Id., Documenti vaticani contro l'eresia cited above, pp. 159-60.

70. E. Belligni, Renata di Francia cited above, p. 286; A. Prosperi, L'eresia del Libro Grande cited above, p. 145.

71. M. Firpo, La presa di potere cited above, pp. 188 ff.

72. See above, section VII.5; on him, see PM, vol. I, pp. 26-31.

73. BAV, Vat. lat., 6407, ff. 56r-57v.

74. CT, vol. X, p. 380; on Bertano, see PM, vol. I, p. 5, note 7.

75. PM, vol. I, p. 54, note 1; see above, section VIII.4.

76. On these figures, it is enough to refer to the notes devoted to them in PM, vol. I, ad indicem.

77. A. Prosperi, L'eresia del Libro Grande cited above, pp. 226 ff., 246 ff.

78. E. Bonora, I conflitti della Controriforma cited above, pp. 475 ff.

79. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 53v.

80. See ibid., f. 54r.

81. E. Bonora, I conflitti della Controriforma cited above, pp. 511 ff.

82. Ibid., pp. 515 ff.; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 603-6.

83. E. Bonora, I conflitti della Controriforma cited above, pp. 518-19.

84. Ibid., pp. 520-22.

85. See ibid., pp. 166 ff.

86. ACDF, Stanza storica, L. 6-n, ff. 22r-23v; see ibid., Decreta, vol. I, f. 64v, the minutes of the meeting of 26 April 1552; Sergio Pagano, *La condanna delle opere di fra' Battista da Crema. Tre inedite censure del Sant'Offizio e della Congregazione dell'Indice*, in "Barnabiti Studi," XIV (1997), pp. 259-80; Giorgio Caravale, L'orazione proibita. Censura ecclesiastica e letteratura devozionale nella prima età moderna, Olschki, Florence 2003, pp. 109-10, 134-37.

87. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae cited above, vol. IV, p. 487.

88. See above, section XII.1.

89. H. Nadal, Commentarii cited above, p. 647.

90. Michela Catto, Le "costituzioni" gesuitiche tra tradizione religiosa e modernità, in Thomas M. McCoog (eds.), Ite inflammate omnia. Selected Historical Papers from Conferences held at Loyola and Rome in 2006, Institutum historicum Societatis Iesu, Rome 2010, pp. 159-82, especially pp. 159-61.

91. SAG, Estado, 871, no. 40.

92. P. Tacchi Venturi, Storia della Compagnia di Gesú cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 278-82.

93. G. Mongini, "Ad Christi similitudinem" cited above, pp. 49-50; Id., Maschere dell'identità cited above, pp. 301 ff.

94. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae cited above, vol. I, pp. 114-18.

95. Fontes narrativi de sancto Ignatio de Loyola et de Societiatis Iesu initiis, ed. Dionysius Fernandez Zapico and Candidus de Dalmases, with the collaboration of Petro Leturia, 4 vols., apud Monumenta historica Societatis Iesu, Rome 1945-51, vol. I, pp. 492, 582; see Franco Motta, *La compagine sacra. Elementi di un mito delle origini nella storiografia sulla Compagnia di Gesú*, in "Rivista storica italiana,"

CXVII (2005), pp. 5-25; Massimo Firpo, “Cor unum et anima una in Domino.” Immagini agiografiche e falsificazione storica (da san Domenico a sant’Ignazio), in “Una strana voglia di vivere.” A Grado Giovanni Merlo, edited by Marina Benedetti and Maria Luisa Betri, Edizioni Biblioteca francescana, Milan 2010, pp. 213-27, now in idem, *Storie di immagini*, cited above, pp. 203-18, especially pp. 209 ff. On the severe tensions between the Jesuits and Paul IV, see G. Mongini, *I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento*, cited above, pp. 41 ff.

96. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

97. G. Mongini, I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento cited above, p. 24.

98. For a brief reference to Morone’s role in a benefice affair in which the Jesuits were involved, see Flavio Rurale, I gesuiti a Milano. Religione e politica nel secondo Cinquecento, Bulzoni, Rome 1992, p. 54; no relevant information emerges from Alessandro Visconti, Notizie storico-giuridiche sulla Compagnia di Gesú. Con documenti riguardanti la sua attività in Lombardia, Società editrice libraria, Milan 1913.

99. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 24-25, Loyola’s letter to Foscarari of 3 December 1551.

100. Ibid., p. 25, note 4.

101. Ibid., vol. VII, p. 468.

102. PM, vol. I, pp. 439-40. In his testimony for the defense in 1560, Foscarari specified that when he had asked Morone for twenty-five scudi a year to support the college, the cardinal had granted fifty, and when he had asked that the commitment last four years, Morone replied that it would be perpetual (ibid., vol. II, p. 990; see also p. 816). On the foundation of the Modena college, see P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesú*, cited above, vol. II/2, pp. 465 ff.

103. Epistolae mixtae, cited above, vol. IV, p. 520; see also Iacobi Lainii, Epistolae et acta, 8 vols., typis Gabrielis López del Horno, Matriti 1912-17, vol. I, p. 617; Lancillotti, vol. XI, pp. 162, 169, 176.

104. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. VI, p. 210; see Loyola’s letter to Silvestro Landino of 12 March 1552 (Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. IV, p. 189).

105. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. XII, p. 9; vol. XI, p. 207, letters of 20 June and 1 April 1556.

106. Morone, for example, is not mentioned in John W. O’Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris, and T. Frank Kennedy, eds., The Jesuits. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773, University of Toronto Press, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2000; nor in the same editors’ The Jesuits II. Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts 1540-1773, with the same subtitle, University of Toronto Press, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2006; nor in Luce Giard, ed., Les jésuites à la Renaissance. Système éducatif et production du savoir, Presses universitaires de France, Paris 1995; Vincent J. Duminuco, ed., The Jesuits’ “Ratio studiorum.” 400th Anniversary Perspectives, Fordham University Press, New York 2000; R. A. Maryks, ed., *A Companion to Ignatius of Loyola*, cited above. John W. O’Malley, Saints or Devils Incarnate? Studies in Jesuit History, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2013, p. 63, and Claudio Ferlan, I gesuiti, il Mulino, Bologna 2015, p. 46, give only a brief mention of Morone as founder of the German College.

107. J. W. O’Malley, *I primi gesuiti*, cited above, discussed by Alessandro Guerra, Note a margine della vita religiosa nel Cinquecento: i “primi gesuiti,” in “Dimensioni e problemi della ricerca storica,” no. 1 (2000), pp. 89-99; M. Bataillon, *Érasme et l’Espagne*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 280-304, and idem, Les jésuites dans l’Espagne du XVIe siècle, edited by Pierre-Antoine Fabre, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 2009, especially pp. 135 ff.; see also the collection of essays by G. Mongini, “Ad Christi similitudinem,” cited above, and the special issue of “Ricerche di storia sociale e religiosa,” nos. 85-86 (2014), edited by Mongini. On Loyola’s burdensome symbolic legacy, see M. Catto, *La Compagnia divisa*, cited above; F. Motta, *La compagine sacra*, cited above.

108. Michela Catto, Dagli esercizi spirituali alle costituzioni della Compagnia di Gesú. Il discernimento spirituale e il governare. La struttura di un "modo di procedere", in Achille Olivieri (eds.), Strutture e forme del "discorso" storico, Unicopli, Milan 2005, pp. 209-31, especially pp. 218 ff.; G. Mongini, "Ad Christi similitudinem" cited above, pp. 33-34; Id., Maschere dell'identità cited above, pp. 189 ff.

109. Ángel Suquía, Las reglas para sentir con la Iglesia en la vida y en las obras del cardinal Gaspar Contarini (1483-1542), in "Archivium historicum Societatis Iesu," XXV (1956), pp. 380-95; G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, p. 54. On Pole's distancing himself from the Society, see instead Thomas F. Mayer, A Test of Wills. Cardinal Pole, Ignatius Loyola, and the Jesuits in England, in Thomas M. McCoog, ed., The Reckoned Expense. Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits. Essays in Celebration of the First Centenary of Campion Hall, Oxford (1896-1996), The Boydell Press, Woodbridge 1996, pp. 21-37.

110. G. Caravale, Ambrogio Catarino Politi e i primi gesuiti cited above, p. 88.

111. In the Prosopographia heroum atque illustrium virorum totius Germaniae, printed at Basel in 1565, the Swiss Heinrich Pantaleon reported, for example, that when Loyola arrived in Venice, Morone, impressed by certain aspects of the religious life of that small community, interceded with Paul III to have the order approved, which the pope then did (P. Canisii, *Epistulae et acta*, cited above, vol. V, p. 850). On Pantaleon, a theologian and professor of medicine at the University of Basel, see Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, Religion and the Book in Early Modern England. The Making of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," Cambridge University Press, New York-Cambridge 2011, pp. 96-97.

112. G. Mongini, I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento cited above, pp. 19-51, see p. 42; Id., "Ad Christi similitudinem" cited above, e soprattutto la sintesi Id., Maschere dell'identità cited above

113. Flavio Rurale, La Compagnia di Gesú tra riforme, controriforme e riconferma dell'Istituto (1540 - inizio XVII secolo), in "Cheiron", XXII (2005), pp. 25-52.

114. M. Scaduto, L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez cited above, vol. III, p. 468.

115. Polanco's Ephemerides record, for example, the continuity of the cardinal's provisions for the German College without ever mentioning his arrest (J. A. de Polanco, *Epistolae et commentaria*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 610, 622).

116. See above, section VII.2.

117. See below, section XVI.4.

118. M. Catto, Le "costituzioni" gesuitiche cited above, pp. 175 ff.; Id., La Compagnia divisa cited above, pp. 17 ff.

119. A. Vanni, "Fare diligente inquisitione" cited above, pp. 149-50.

120. c. Cargnoni (eds.), I frati cappuccini cited above. vol. I, pp. 249 ff. (see pp. 244-48), 353, 416.

121. Ibid., pp. 372, 463-64.

122. See J. Duminuco, ed., The Jesuits' "Ratio studiorum," cited above. The volume *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu* was printed at Naples in 1599, although it bears the date 1598.

123. A. Guerra, *Note a margine*, cited above, p. 94, discussing J. W. O'Malley, *I primi gesuiti*, cited above, pp. 227-36.

124. See below, section XXIII.2.

125. Sabina Pavone, I gesuiti in Italia 1548-1773, in Atlante della letteratura italiana, edited by Sergio Luzzatto e Gabriele Pedullà, 3 vols., Einaudi, Turin 2010-12, vol. II, pp. 359-73.

126. G. Mongini, I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento cited above, p. 30.

127. See above, section XII.1.

128. A. Guerra, Note a margine cited above, pp. 91.

129. G. Mongini, I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento cited above, p. 38.

130. A. Guerra, Note a margine cited above, pp. 92, 95.

131. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. II, p. 422; vol. III, p. 11; M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 226 ff.; Ricardo G. Villoslada, Storia del collegio Romano dal suo inizio (1551) alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesú, apud aedes Universitatis Gregorianae, Rome 1954, pp. 24-25, 29; Johannes G. Gerhartz, Colegio Germánico-húngaro, Roma, *in Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 840-42; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 90. At his death in 1580, Morone left five hundred scudi to the Roman College (MiAGS, ms XLI. E. 2).

132. In February 1560, shortly before Morone's acquittal, Laínez commented on the polemical aftermath that the trial had left between the cardinal and Salmerón, writing to his confrères in Modena: "To those who remain dissatisfied with the Society because of Cardinal Morone, you can say that, if they love him, they ought to imitate him, for he is very affectionate toward and a benefactor of our Society today and was so in the past, in Modena, in Rome, and everywhere" (P. Tacchi Venturi, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesú*, cited above, vol. II/2, p. 234).

133. PM, vol. II, p. 816.

134. Ibid., pp. 794, 810, 873, 916, 939, 1044.

135. Ibid., p. 151.

136. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 440-41; see vol. II, p. 939.

137. Fontes narrativi de sancto Ignatio de Loyola cited above, vol. III, p. 331; see M. Scaduto, L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez cited above, vol. IV, p. 228.

138. P. Tacchi Venturi, Storia della Compagnia di Gesú cited above, vol. I/1, p. 342.

139. R. G. Villoslada, *Storia del collegio Romano*, cited above, pp. 25-28. Thomas J. Campbell's thesis in The Jesuits, 1534-1921. A History of the Society of Jesus from its Foundation to the Present Time, electronic reprint of the 1921 edition (The Floating Press, Portland 2013), p. 56, that Truchsess was the true originator of the initiative now appears scarcely credible. Morone, rather, appears as founder of the college in several contemporary Jesuit sources, for example Pedro de Ribadeneira, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, ex officina Christophori Plantini, Antverpiae 1587, pp. 377, 379; Nadal's chronicle (Fontes narrativi de sancto Ignatio de Loyola, cited above, vol. II, p. 213); and Loyola's own letters (Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. IV, p. 173). On Truchsess's important role in founding the Hieronymianum at Dillingen, a seminary avant la lettre created toward the end of 1549, see M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 227.

140. J. W. O'Malley, I primi gesuiti cited above, p. 257.

141. See Nadal's letter to Ignatius Loyola of 30 March 1555: "The most reverend legate told us that there is little hope that they will send money from Germany to Rome to support the German College, and, as I understand it, His Most Reverend Lordship did not have the courage to speak of this" (Hieronymi Nadal, Epistolae, 4 vols., typis Augustini Avrial, Madrid 1898-1905, vol. I, p. 289).

142. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae cited above, vol. IX, p. 359; see p. 465.

143. G. Mongini, I gesuiti e i papi nel Cinquecento cited above, pp. 38-39 e 43-45.

144. Esther Jiménez Pablo, *Intereses religiosos en conflicto: la Compañía de Jesús y Paulo IV*, in "Tiempos modernos. Revista electrónica de Historia moderna," XXXVII (2018), pp. 434-50; SAG, Estado, 891, no. 47, letter of 1 April 1561 to six cardinals, including Morone.

145. J. A. de Polanco, *Epistolae et commentaria* cited above, vol. I, p. 231.

146. M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 272-73; see also Polanco's letter to Borja of 16 March 1560, published in Monumenta Borgia, vols. VI-VIII, edited by Enrique García Hernán, Generalitat valenciana-Institutum historicum Societatis Iesu, Valencia-Rome 2003-2009, vol. VII, p. 123.

147. See Polanco's letter to Canisius of 4 January 1561 (P. Canisii, *Epistulae et acta*, cited above, vol. III, p. 3; see also p. 21; see J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. V, p. 253).

148. R. G. Villoslada, Storia del collegio Romano cited above, passim.

149. J. W. O'Malley, I primi gesuiti cited above, pp. 258-59.

150. Enrique García Hernán and María del Pilar Ryan, eds., Francisco de Borja y su tiempo. Política, religión y cultura en la edad moderna, Albatros-Institutum historicum Societatis Jesu, Valencia-Rome 2012; Monumenta Borgia, cited above, vol. VII, p. 26 of the Introducción.

151. Maria Barbara Guerrieri Borsoi, *Casini seicenteschi di villeggiatura ai piedi di Frascati*, in "Quaderni Pau", XIX-XX (2009-10), pp. 89-106, especially p. 93).

152. H. Nadal, Epistolae cited above, vol. III, p. 238.

153. Ibid., vol. IV, pp. 800, 803-8.

154. Ibid., p. 407; see Pietro Tacchi Venturi, La Casa di S. Ignazio di Loyola in Rome, Casa editrice "Roma", Rome s. d.

155. M. Scaduto, L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez cited above, vol. IV, p. 556.

XIV. "For Cardinal Morone" or "Against Cardinal Morone"? From Julius III to Paul IV.

1. E. BONORA, I conflitti della Controriforma cited above, pp. 517-18.

2. G. CARAVALE, Sulle tracce dell'eresia cited above, pp. 128 ff.

3. See above, section X.1.

4. DAVID GUTIÉRREZ, *Testi e note su l'ultimo quadriennio del generalato di Seripando*, in "Analecta augustiniana", XXVIII, (1965), pp. 281-382, especially pp. 379, 381.

5. GIORGIO CARAVALE, Cervini contro Vergerio: un intervento previdente dell'Inquisizione romana, in Pier Paolo Vergerio il Giovane cited above, pp. 33-52.

6. A copy of the brief of appointment, dated 13 February 1550, is in PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 434. On the care with which the cardinal of Santa Croce monitored heterodox preaching, see the documents preserved in FiAS, Carte Cervini, 29, ff. 79r, 89r, 90r-94v, 372r. On his Instructio ad praedicatores of 1549, see above, section VII.4 and note 133.

7. C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 284 ff., *presents a much more complex profile than W. V. Hudon's slender biography Marcello Cervini*, cited above. Hudon later restated the thesis that those under investigation and their inquisitors pursued different but not conflicting programs of reform and, in his judgment, "had a great deal in common" (ibid., p. 21), by virtue of the "complexities and ambiguities of the age" and the "standard ambivalence, if not inherent contradiction, of reformers throughout Christian history," in idem, Religion and Society in Early Modern Italy. Old Questions, *New Insights*, in "American Historical Review," CI (1996), pp. 783-804. A similar judgment, likewise based on underestimating the trial records, is found in T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above; idem, What to Call the "Spirituali," in Adriano Prosperi, Pierangelo Schiera, and Gabriella Zarri, eds., Chiesa cattolica e mondo moderno. Scritti in onore di Paolo Prodi, il Mulino, Bologna 2007, pp. 11-26. On Cervini, in addition to Giampiero Brunelli, Marcello II, papa, in DBI, vol. LXIX, pp. 502-10, see Adriano Prosperi's introduction to Papa Marcello II Cervini e la Chiesa della prima metà del '500, proceedings of the conference (Montepulciano, 4 May 2002), edited by Carlo Prezzolini and Valeria Novembri, Le Balze, Montepulciano 2003, pp. 15-23, and S. Giombi, *Un ecclesiastico tridentino*, cited above.

8. ASV, Conc. trid., 139, ff. 47r-53r, the letters he addressed to Massarelli urging him to conduct the investigations in the utmost secrecy; on Nacchianti, see above, section XII.2.

9. FiAS, Carte Cervini, 44, f. 51r.

10. Fabrizio Biferali e Massimo Firpo, Battista Franco “pittore viniziano” nella cultura artistica e nella vita religiosa del ’500, Edizioni della Normale, Pisa 2007, pp. 178 ff.

11. See above, section VIII.3.

12. See above, section VII.2.

13. See above, section VIII.3.

14. G. Dall’Olio, *Eretici e inquisitori*, cited above, p. 172; P. Scaramella, *I primi gesuiti e l’Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 135-57, now in idem, Inquisizioni, eresie, etnie. Dissenso religioso e giustizia ecclesiastica in Italia (secc. XVI-XVIII), Cacucci, Bari 2005, pp. 91-115, especially pp. 104-5.

15. W. V. Hudon, Marcello Cervini cited above, p. 125; c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 305-6.

16. c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 393 ff.

17. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 599-600; G. Dall’Olio, Eretici e inquisitori cited above, pp. 215-16.

18. c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 404-5.

19. W. V. Hudon, *Marcello Cervini*, cited above, pp. 126-27, according to whom, until 1550, Cervini’s inquisitorial policy “clearly varied according to individual circumstances,” and he “certainly supported the use of force in theory but, in practice, often sought to mitigate such procedures”; wholly unfounded, however, is the assertion that “such a policy was not dissimilar from that of Giovanni Morone.” The two judgments that follow are from G. Brunelli, Marcello II, papa, cited above, p. 509, and C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, p. 374.

20. Benedetto da Mantova, Il Beneficio di Cristo cited above, pp. 432-36.

21. c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, p. 426.

22. ASV, Conc. trid., 139, f. 45r; see above, section IX.1.

23. PM, vol. I, p. 592.

24. c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 425 ff.

25. D. Marcatto, “Questo passo dell’heresia” cited above, p. 228.

26. Ibid., pp. 56-57, 83 ff.; c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 413 ff., 426.

27. PM, vol. II, p. 1006.

28. See above, section XII.3; a few years later G. A. Santoro, *De persecutionis haereticae pravitatis historia*, cited above, f. [1r], would write that Merenda had been tortured and had named many companions in the faith.

29. PM, vol. I, p. 820.

30. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1010-11.

31. See below, section XIV.1.

32. PM, vol. II, pp. 1011-12.

33. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 818, 827; see above, section V.4.

34. PM, vol. II, p. 1012.

35. Ibid., p. 1010.

36. Ibid., p. 1012.

37. Processi Soranzo, vol. I, pp. 152 ff. (see note 1 for a biographical sketch of him).

38. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 610-11, note 2.

39. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, p. 6; see p. 159. On 7 January 1557 the Bolognese priest had written Morone a letter rich in spiritual allusions, in which, among other things, he expressed the hope that Christ, "loving to burn and shine in Your Lordship, may also deign to love to find himself always rekindled in me together with you by his holy and sweetest love" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 151r).

40. M. Firpo, Vittore Soranzo cited above, p. 437.

41. See above, section VI.3.

42. PM, vol. III, p. 728.

43. See above, section VII.2.

44. See above, section VIII.3.

45. CT, vol. I, pp. 826-27, 829, 840; ASV, Conc. trid., 139, ff. 51r, 53r, 54r; FiAS, Carte Cervini, 23, ff. 140r, 141r, 142r, 158r, 174bisr; see also 45, f. 72r, Tommaso Stella's letter to Cervini from Venice of 5 December 1551; C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 306-7 and passim.

46. PM, vol. III, pp. 728-29.

47. Luigi Carcereri, Riforma e Inquisizione nel ducato di Urbino verso la metà del sec. XVI, Tip. G. Marchiori, Verona 1911, p. 20.

48. ASV, Conc. trid., 139, f. 17r; see also f. 16r, the letter of 16 June; on him, see Guido Dall'Olio, Linguardo, Francesco, in DBI, vol. LXV, pp. 160-61. The memorial against him preserved in ACDF, Stanza storica, L. 6-n, ff. 57r-58v, must undoubtedly be attributed to Scotti.

49. Ibid., f. 34r; only if he accepted those conditions, he insisted on 5 November, would it be possible to exercise "clemency and mercy" toward him (f. 45r).

50. Ibid., f. 23r.

51. F. Negri, Tragedia cited above, p. K2r.

52. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 4v, 35v, 45r, minutes of 12 February 1549, 9 October 1550, and 29 May 1551; for the payments, see ff. 51r, 62r, the minutes of 23 November 1551 and 29 March 1552, when payments of twelve and then ten scudi were ordered.

53. ASV, Conc. trid., 139, ff. 51r, 53r, 54r (9 and 20 February, 13 March 1549); more generally, see ff. 17r ff.; ibid., 140, ff. 1r ff.

54. Ibid., 139, ff. 79r e ff.

55. Ibid., f. 38r.

56. The documents concerning Soranzo, Flaminio, and Pole (ACDF, Stanza storica, S. 4-g) are published in Processi Soranzo, vol. II, pp. 610-15 and note 2; those concerning the Milanese cardinal and Colonna are in PM, vol. I, pp. 8 ff.

57. See above, section XIII.1.

58. PM, vol. I, p. 213.

59. Alphonsi Salmeronis, Epistolae, 2 vols., Institutum historicum Societatis Iesu, Romae 1971, vol. I, pp. 99, 294-95; see c. Quaranta, Marcello II Cervini cited above, p. 409, note 207.

60. PM, vol. I, p. 1107.

61. Ibid., pp. 236-37; see p. 1115.

62. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. 83, 142.

63. Se ne veda l'edizione in Processi Soranzo, vol. II, pp. 610 ff.

64. PM, vol. I, pp. 243-44; see also p. 242.

65. See above, section XIII.1.

66. Processi Soranzo, vol. II, pp. 611-12, note.

67. The hand of the Sienese Dominican is evident in the drafting of the memorial Pro cardinali Polo, which mentions a young Sienese whom the English cardinal allegedly tried to win over to his doctrines with certain writings; the young man, however, decided to show them to Catarino (ibid., p. 612, note 2; see G. Caravale, *Sulle tracce dell'eresia*, cited above, pp. 149-50).

68. PM, vol. I, p. 43.

69. Ibid., pp. 219-20.

70. On him, see ibid., p. 209, note 15; Guido Dall'Olio's entry Gelido, Pietro, in DBI, vol. LIII, pp. 2-5; and the same author's essay Pietro Gelido dalla corte di Roma alla legazione di Avignone (1496-1545), in Circolazione di uomini e d'idee tra Italia ed Europa nell'età della Controriforma, proceedings of the conference (Torre Pellice, 1-3 September 1996), *edited by Susanna Peyronel Rambaldi*, in "Bollettino della Società di studi valdesi," CXIV (1997), pp. 79-106; Salvatore Lo Re, Ambrogio Catarino Politi e alcuni retroscena delle sue controversie (in margine al "Processo Morone"), in Mario Rosa, ed., Eretici esuli e indemoniati nell'età moderna, Olschki, Florence 1998, pp. 13-60, especially pp. 21 ff.; G. Caravale, *Sulle tracce dell'eresia*, cited above, pp. 146-48.

71. PM, vol. I, pp. 591-92.

72. Ibid., p. 216. These were probably the two letters Pero sent to Catarino in March 1550 (noted ibid., p. 1156), documenting the English cardinal's proselytizing activity.

73. Ibid., p. 592.

74. Ibid., p. 213.

75. S. Lo Re, Ambrogio Catarino Politi cited above, pp. 36 ff.

76. G. Caravale, Sulle tracce dell'eresia cited above, pp. 274-76.

77. Ibid., pp. 203 ff., e passim.

78. This is suggested by a letter addressed to him on 5 December 1551 by another inveterate hunter of heretics, Annibale Grisonio, who wrote, among other things, that Scotti had informed him of his return to Rome (C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, p. 409, note 207).

79. Processi Soranzo, vol. I, p. 641, note.

80. The effective phrase is C. Quaranta's, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, p. 427; see p. 396.

81. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, ff. 68v, 82v.

82. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 52, f. 39r.

83. PM, vol. II, p. 1007.

84. Ibid., p. 1008.

85. Ibid., p. 1016; see p. 1019.

86. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 18-19. In 1555 Scotti would state, among other things: "When I was in Rome in Monsignor Catarino's household, I heard either from Monsignor Catarino himself or, as seems more likely to me, from the bishop of Capodistria, called the German [Tommaso Stella], that the aforesaid most reverend Morone, speaking with the most reverend Cardinal [Francisco] de Mendoza, otherwise of Burgos, told him that the decree on justification was unsound and had to be retracted" (ibid., pp. 236-37). On the memorial of the cardinal of Burgos, see below, section XXI.6.

87. PM, vol. I, pp. 420-21.

88. Ibid., p. 1081.

89. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, pp. 422, 894.

90. Monumenti di varia letteratura cited above, vol. I/2, p. 302.

91. PM, vol. II, pp. 1016-17.

92. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 444 ff.

93. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1008-9.

94. Ibid., p. 1024; see vol. I, pp. 17, 237, and above, section VIII.4.

95. G. Romeo, L'Inquisizione nell'Italia moderna cited above, p. 25.

96. See above, section XIII.1.

97. See above, sections XII.2 and XIII.2.

98. For fuller bibliographical information, see Antonio Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, Moti d'Italia e tumulti di Germania: la crisi del 1552, *in L'Italia di Carlo V*, cited above, pp. 337-74.

99. Stefania Pastore, *Una Spagna anti-papale? Gli anni italiani di Diego Hurtado de Mendoza*, in "Roma moderna e contemporanea", XV (2007), pp. 63-94, especially p. 83.

100. CT, vol. XI, p. 691; see pp. 700 ff.

101. See below, section XV.2.

102. See, for example, the letters he sent respectively to Philip II and Charles V on 6 and 11 January 1554, summarized in CSP, Spain, vol. XII, pp. 8, 21-22.

103. Ibid., vol. XI, p. 478; see SAG, Estado, 881, no. 55, Manrique's letter to Charles V of 12 June 1554.

104. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], Giudicio sopra le lettere di tredeci huomini illustri, pubblicate da messer Dionigi Atanagi et stampate in Venetia nell'anno 1554, s. i. t. [1554], p. [Bvii]r; see above, section X.1.

105. CT, vol. XI, p. 585.

106. See PM, vol. I, p. 95.

107. Processi Davidico, p. 155.

108. Ibid., pp. 127-28; see also p. 122.

109. See Matteo Daverio's letter to the countess of Guastalla (Rome, 18 March 1552), in which he reported a meeting between Davidico and the cardinal of Carpi (AGB, L.a.6, no. 8; see E. Bonora, *I conflitti della Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 475 ff.).

110. Processi Davidico, p. 129.

111. The short treatise, dated 22 November 1553, was later published in the collection of Lorenzo Davidico's writings, Opuscoli, per Andrea Bresciano, Perugia 1554, pp. 46r-52v; see p. 47v.

112. Processi Davidico, p. 122 (corsivo aggiunto).

113. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 356 ff.

114. See above, section XIII.1.

115. PM, vol. I, pp. 150-52; see also pp. 596-97, and pp. 84, 658, which show that echoes of the clash between Morone and Davidico had also reached Bartoli's ears; Processi Davidico, pp. 121, 155.

116. Ibid., p. 116.

117. Questioned about this matter, Davidico would state that he had told Lachi only that he had spoken "to one of the most reverend cardinal inquisitors," without remembering whether he had specified the names of his interlocutors: "It may be that I said the most reverend Monsignor of Carpi" (ibid., p. 140).

118. Ibid., p. 155; see also p. 128.

119. Ibid., p. 141.

120. PM, vol. I, pp. 1 ff.; see below, section XVI.1.

121. PM, vol. I, pp. 38 sgg; see above, section XI.2.

122. PM, vol. I, pp. 152-53; see p. 621; vol. II, p. 962. Davidico would say that Gheri and Rovelli "carried away many of my writings" (Processi Davidico, p. 110).

123. Processi Davidico, p. 138; see also PM, vol. I, p. 152. It is worth noting that, as papal vicar, Archinto had signed the imprimatur for several books published in Rome by Davidico, including Steccato spirituale (1550), Compendiolum cui titulus est Thesaurus animae (1551), Giostra spirituale (1551), Rocca franca (1551), Gioiello del vero christiano (1552), Sperone de' tepidi (1552), Candore della catholica verità (1553), Fatto de arme interiore circa la spirituale crocifissione del christiano (1552), and La Davidica e Caccia villano (1554).

124. PM, vol. I, p. 153.

125. Processi Davidico, p. 101.

126. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae* cited above, vol. IV, p. 154; see M. Firpo, Nel labirinto del mondo cited above, pp. 143 ff.

127. M. FIRPO, Nel labirinto del mondo cited above, p. 140; see Lorenzo Davidico, La Davidica e Caccia villano, per Valerio et Aloysio Dorici fratelli bresciani impressori del populo romano, in Rome 1554 (due frontespizi, ma unica numerazione di pagina).

128. L. Davidico, Opuscoli, cited above (printing completed on 27 April); the imprimatur is on p. 3r.

129. Ibid., p. 39v.

130. Ibid., pp. 74r-82v; see pp. 19r, 78r. Another reference to Morone may be found in the words with which he denounced the hypocrisy of a man who "to look at him appears a little saint, but in practice he does not turn out so for me, for he will be a demon in the flesh because of some Lutheran tares with which he makes war on God" (ibid., p. 75v).

131. Processi Davidico, pp. 120-21. The date of this meeting can be inferred from what Davidico himself said shortly afterward, referring to Archinto's imminent departure for his nunciature in Venice (ibid., p. 123), to which he had been appointed on 26 June 1554.

132. Epistolae mixtae, cited above, vol. IV, p. 445, Mercuriano's letter to Polanco of that day.

133. "Master Lorenzo Davidico has come here and appeared to visit us," Rome wrote to Mercuriano on 24 November (Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae, cited above, vol. VIII, p. 101).

134. L. Davidico, La Davidica cited above, p. 2v.

135. Ibid., pp. 19r ff.

136. Processi Davidico, pp. 110-12, 124; see pp. 223-24.

137. See Basilio Ferrari's letter to Gian Pietro Besozzi, Rome, 15 October 1555 (AGB, M.b.57, no. 15, published by Orazio Premoli, Lorenzo Davidico (1513-1574), in "La Scuola cattolica," XL [1912], vol. XXIII, pp. 164-87, 282-97, especially pp. 185-87, with some transcription errors; Processi Davidico, p. 126).

138. AGB, M.b.57, no. 15; published by O. Premoli, *Lorenzo Davidico*, cited above, pp. 185-87.

139. PM, vol. I, pp. 458-59.

140. Ibid., pp. 621-22; see vol. II, p. 962.

141. Processi Davidico, p. 146.

142. PM, vol. I, p. 622.

143. Processi Davidico, p. 146; see p. 120.

144. Ibid., p. 162; see p. 128.

145. J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae* cited above, vol. V, p. 73; Litterae quadrimestres ex universis praeter Indiam et Brasiliam locis in quibus aliqui de Societate Jesu versabantur Romam missae, 7 vols., Augustinus Avrial - La Editorial Ibérica, Matriti-Romae 1894-1932, vol. III, pp. 319, 328.

146. Ignatii de Loyola, Epistolae cited above, vol. VIII, pp. 553-54.

147. On Cervini's visit to Loreto during Lent 1555, on the eve of his election, see J. A. de Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae*, cited above, vol. V, p. 79; Litterae quadrimestres, cited above, vol. III, pp. 324, 333-34.

148. Processi Davidico, p. 168; see also pp. 192, 198, and Davidico's letter to the cardinal of Carpi of April-May 1556, appended to the trial records (ibid., pp. 164-65).

149. Ibid., p. 160.

150. Ibid., p. 170.

151. See above, section XIII.2; on Pole's return to England, see T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 203 ff.; J. Edwards, *Archbishop Pole*, cited above, pp. 109 ff.

152. "For many considerations of mine deserving attention," he wrote to him on 20 January 1554, "I have reason to proceed very cautiously, and I must avoid allowing myself to become involved in what ordinarily ought to pass through other hands, especially in matters of such importance; nevertheless, because of the service I owe you, I do not refuse to do it, nor will any consideration of mine ever restrain me from performing every office in my power for your service" (NB1, vol. XV, p. 114; see also p. 136, note 12, Pole's brief reply, and pp. 144-45, Morone's further response of 28 February).

153. Ibid., p. 36.

154. Ibid., pp. 80-81, 88; see M. Firpo, Sulla legazione di pace cited above, pp. 821 ff.

155. NB1, vol. XV, p. 55, note 2.

156. Ibid., pp. 72-73, note 7, letter of 22 October 1553.

157. Ibid., p. 87.

158. Ibid., p. 93.

159. Ibid., pp. 94-98, 102-4.

160. Ibid., pp. 108 ff.

161. Ibid., p. 150; see p. 155; and Alvise Priuli's letter to Morone of 3 June 1554 (ibid., p. 199).

162. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 92-93; see also NB1, vol. XV, pp. 233-35.

163. P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole cited above, pp. 110 ff.

164. NB1, vol. XV, p. 202.

165. See ibid., vol. XVII, p. 17, note 4, the letter of the two Habsburg sovereigns sent to Julius III as early as 30 March 1554, in which Morone and Bertano were named as men who had already acted very well in Germany and were experienced in German affairs; vol. XIV, pp. 204, 230; vol. XVI, p. 17, note 4, 29-30, 36.

166. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 96-97; see Joseph Grisar, *Die Sendung des Kardinals Morone als Legat zum Reichstag von Augsburg 1555*, in "Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Schwaben", LXI (1955), pp. 341-87, especially p. 358.

167. The instructions of 31 January 1555 for Antonio Augustín, sent as nuncio to England, informed him of Morone's legation to the Diet of Augsburg, "although His Holiness detests it greatly because it is to be a mixed assembly of Catholics and heretics and of ecclesiastical prelates and temporal lords, to whom it does not belong to treat matters concerning our holy Catholic faith" (H. Laemmer, *Meletematum romanorum mantissa*, cited above, p. 170, which incorrectly dates the document to 1554); see J. Grisar, *Die Sendung*, cited above, pp. 358-59.

168. NB1, vol. XIII, pp. 203-4, note 4; see also pp. 203-5, Muzzarelli's letter to Innocenzo Del Monte of 13 January.

169. Ibid., p. 204, note 4. On the historic turning point marked by the Diet of Augsburg, the confessional pluralism it legally sanctioned, and its consequences not only in the Empire but also in forcing a change in

papal policy—a change that would nevertheless have to await the pontificates of Pius IV and Gregory XIII, after those of the inquisitors Paul IV and Pius V—see the perceptive observations of Elena Bonora, *"Come s'egli non fusse al mondo." Paolo IV e l'Europa*, in "Tiempos modernos. Revista eléctronica de Historia moderna," XXXVII (2018), pp. 341-86.

170. J. Grisar, Die Sendung cited above, pp. 361-66; PM, vol. II, pp. 712-21.

171. Ibid., p. 381; see pp. 369 ff., his memorials of June-August 1554 (but see also pp. 383-84, some opinions of German princes opposed to sending Morone); NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 29-30, his letter to Morone of 30 January 1555; and MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Truchsess von Waldburg Otto, the letters he sent to Carlo Gualteruzzi between late January and 3 March of that year.

172. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 31-34; see p. 36.

173. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 612.

174. NB1, vol. XVII, p. 39.

175. See his letter of 15 June 1555 to Francisco Vargas, then imperial ambassador in Venice (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, ff. 106v-107r).

176. Thus Johannes Visbroc, who was accompanying the cardinal, wrote to Andreas Masius on 31 March 1555 (Briefe von Andreas Masius, cited above, p. 198).

177. PM, vol. I, pp. 195-97, 578-79.

178. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1029-30.

179. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], Reginaldi Poli cardinalis britanni pro ecclesiasticae unitatis defensione libri quatuor, in quibus conatus est maximo studio Ecclesiae romanae primatum constabilire, Argentorati 1555, p. aiiiv; [idem], *Epistolae duae duorum amicorum*, cited above, p. 252. Vergerio wrote very similar words in a letter to the duke of Württemberg of 9 February 1555, in which he declared himself ready to go to Augsburg to unmask Morone's fraudulent stratagems (Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph, cited above, pp. 92, 94; see also pp. 103, 106, 454-55).

180. Emidio Campi, Pier Paolo Vergerio e il suo epistolario con Heinrich Bullinger, in Pier Paolo Vergerio il Giovane cited above, pp. 277-94, especially p. 288, note 45.

181. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 36-38; see pp. 56-58, Morone's reply, dated at Augsburg on 26 March; see vol. XIII, pp. 231, 238, Girolamo Muzzarelli's letters of 17 and 24 March 1555. Morone's arrival was also welcomed by Zaccaria Dolfin, according to whom, when he arrived, "the Catholics immediately took heart and the insolence of the heretics was largely quieted. The opposite was seen when His Most Reverend Lordship had to leave because of the death of Pope Julius III, for the heretics celebrated greatly and the Catholics were left disheartened" (PM, vol. II, pp. 1027-28).

182. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 43-44, 50; MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1409 (copia in MoAC, Capitolo, 109).

183. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 44-47.

184. Ibid., vol. XIII, p. 275.

185. Hubert Jedin, Girolamo Seripando. Sein Leben und Denken in Geisteskampf des 16. Jahrhundert, 2 vols., Rita, Würzburg 1936, vol. II, p. 601 (the italicized passage is crossed out in the original).

186. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 47-48; see J. Grisar, *Die Sendung*, cited above, pp. 385-87, the letters sent to the Sacred College by Ferdinand and Charles of Habsburg and by Dolfin between late March and early May 1555.

187. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 48-49; see vol. XIII, p. 230.

188. Ibid., vol. XVII, pp. 49-56.

189. Ibid., pp. 58-60, where the concluding comment has nevertheless been deleted; we derive it from Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 97-99.

190. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 545.

191. CT, vol. II, pp. 250 ff.; H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando cited above, vol. II, pp. 595, 605.

192. On the conclave, see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 304 ff.; C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 459 ff.; see also the lively account by a Florentine conclavist preserved in FiAS, Mediceo, 3966, ff. 116r-124v.

193. SAG, Estado, 882, no. 23.

XV. “Heresy Must Be Persecuted with Every Severity and Harshness.” Paul IV and the Triumph of the Holy Office.

1. PASTOR, vol. VI, pp. 618-19.

2. H. JEDIN, Girolamo Seripando cited above, vol. II, pp. 593-94.

3. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 52, f. 25v. On 21 April Brussels wrote to England reporting that the strongest candidates were Carafa, Pole, Bertano, Puteo, and Este, but that Cervini was the favorite; on 25 May Morone was added to them (CSP, Mary, pp. 163, no. 346, 169, no. 362), as the principal point of reference for English policy in Rome (PRO, State Papers, 69/6, ff. 108r ff.).

4. PASTOR, vol. VI, p. 304.

5. Bernardino Pia wrote thus on 8 April, but according to Agostino Gonzaga, bishop of Reggio Calabria, these were merely “chatter, […] vanities and maneuvers by merchants concerning wagers” (ibid., pp. 619-20; see P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, p. 72).

6. See Morone’s letter to Beccadelli of 16 April 1555, with this autograph postscript: “I hope Your Lordship will have a pontiff secundum cor suum, who will set matters on their proper course” (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1).

7. See above, section IX.1.

8. C. QUARANTA, Marcello II Cervini cited above, pp. 462.

9. Ibid., p. 464; PASTOR, vol. VI, p. 621.

10. See above, section XIV.1.

11. See above, section XIV.3.

12. H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando cited above, vol. II, p. 605.

13. C. Quaranta, *Marcello II Cervini*, cited above, pp. 466-69 and note 333.

14. CT, vol. II, pp. 257, 258.

15. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 51, ff. 53r ff.

16. CT, vol. II, p. 260.

17. Paolo Manuzio, Lettere volgari divise in quattro libri, Aldus, in Venetia 1560, p. 9r.

18. PM, vol. II, p. 1596.

19. Ibid., vol. III, p. 586; see J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, Contarini, Pole, Morone cited above, p. 298; Massimo Firpo, Teologia e storia nel processo inquisitoriale del cardinal Giovanni Morone, in ANDREAS GOTTSMANN, PIERANTONIO PIATTI e ANDREAS E. REHBERG (eds.), Incorrupta monumenta Ecclesiam defendunt. Studi offerti a monsignor Sergio Pagano prefetto dell’Archivio segreto vaticano, 3 vols., Archivio segreto vaticano, Vatican City 2018, vol. III, pp. 201-15.

20. On the conclave of Paul IV, see CT, vol. II, pp. 262 ff.; Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 340 ff.; Giulio Coggiola, *I Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV*, in “Studi storici,” IX (1900), pp. 61-91, 203-27, 449-79; Antonio Santosuosso, *An Account of the Election of Paul IV to the Pontificate*, in “Renaissance Quarterly,” XXXI (1978), pp. 486-98.

21. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Grossi Giovan Battista.

22. Alain Tallon, Le “parti français” lors de conclaves de 1549-50 et de 1555, in Pouvoirs, contéstations et comportements dans l’Europe moderne. Mélanges en l’honneur du professeur Yves-Marie Bercé, edited by Bernard Barbiche, Jean-Pierre Poussou e Alain Tallon, Presses de l’Université Paris-Sorbonne, Paris 2005, pp. 101-22, see p. 118.

23. NB1, vol. XV, pp. 261-62, note 1.

24. Mantua, BC, Carteggi, 4, Ippolito Capilupi, no. 292. On 8 May Camillo Capilupi informed Guglielmo Gonzaga that the leading candidates were Morone and Carafa, “in both of whom, however, many difficulties are found,” but that many cardinals were offering “not only their votes but their efforts” for the election of the cardinal of Mantua (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 889).

25. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 889.

26. Ibid.; see Pastor, vol. VI, p. 343, note 2.

27. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Grossi Giovan Battista, letter from Giovan Battista Grossi to Ferrante Gonzaga of 22 May 1555; but see the entire group of Grossi’s letters, rich in information about the conclave.

28. PM, vol. II, pp. 869, 871.

29. Michele Cassese, Girolamo Seripando e i vescovi meridionali (1535-1563), 2 vols., Editoriale scientifica, Naples 2002, vol. II, pp. 100, 127.

30. G. Coggiola, I Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV cited above, p. 68,

31. Estratto di una lettera de Roma d’uno amico degnissimo di fede delli 6 di maggio 1555, preserved among Seripando’s papers, published by M. Cassese, *Girolamo Seripando e i vescovi meridionali*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 108-12; see Vinzenz Schweitzer, Zum Prozess des Kardinals Giovanni Morone, in Briefmappe, vol. I, Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster in Westfalen 1912, pp. 56-72, especially p. 56, note 2.

32. G. Coggiola, I Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV cited above, p. 69.

33. M. Cassese, Girolamo Seripando e i vescovi meridionali cited above, vol. II, p. 114; see pp. 119-20.

34. BNNa, ms XIII. AA. 64, f. 61rv; see also the letter of 18 May (ibid., ff. 63r-64v), in which Camaiani repeated that what harmed the Milanese cardinal was his “being too inclined toward the imperialists”; see also ff. 65r-67v.

35. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Grossi Giovan Battista, letters of 18 and 22 May 1555.

36. Ibid.; Pastor, vol. VI, p. 346, note 3; see Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, pp. 46-47.

37. CT, vol. II, p. 509; Gennaro Maria Monti, Studi sulla Riforma cattolica e sul Papato nei secoli XVI-XVII, Vecchi & F., Trani 1941, p. 36.

38. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 64, f. 66r.

39. Briefe von Andreas Masius cited above, p. 201.

40. Lettere di principi, le quali o si scrivono da principi o a principi o ragionan di principi, appresso Giordano Ziletti, in Venetia 1564, p. 184v.

41. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 52, f. 60rv.

42. See above, section XV.1.

43. Guillaume Ribier, Lettres et memoires d’Estat, des roys, princes, ambassadeurs, et autres ministres, sous les regnes de François premier, Henry II & François II, 2 vols., chez François Clouzier, à l’image Nostre-Dame et la vefue Aubouyn, Paris 1666, vol. II, p. 610, where, however, the document is incorrectly dated 26 July; see P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, p. 72.

44. M. Cassese, Girolamo Seripando e i vescovi meridionali cited above, vol. II, p. 109.

45. BAV, Urb. lat., 842, f. 381v.

46. G. Coggiola, I Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV, p. 73.

47. Thus states the report on the conclave sent by Onofrio Camaiani to Cosimo de' Medici, published by A. Santosuosso, *An Account*, cited above, p. 493; see pp. 491 ff.

48. G. Coggiola, I Farnesi ed il conclave di Paolo IV cited above, p. 72.

49. H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando cited above, vol. II, p. 608.

50. In a Conclave of Pope Paul IV it is stated that the Milanese cardinal, a man of "singular qualities," had been accused of heresy and, more seriously still, that Carpi and San Giacomo, leaders of the imperial party and of the Holy Office of the Inquisition, fostered that accusation. For this reason he had finally supported Carafa, thinking "that by so great a service he could placate them and draw them back from the persecution they were directing against him," but without achieving anything. On that occasion Lottini is said to have predicted to him "that he was seeking something of which he would be the first to repent, because the stern goodness of the cardinal of Chieti was not such that, in return for so great a service as making and creating him pope, he would erase a single point of the rigor he displayed in matters of the Holy Inquisition" (FiAS, Mediceo, 3966, ff. 126r-137v, especially ff. 131v, 135v-136r; other copies ibid., 3966a, ff. 45r-53v; 3968, ff. 32r-40v; see ibid., 3968, f. 36rv).

51. PM, vol. I, p. 409; see vol. II, pp. 150-51, 1028.

52. Ibid., vol. I, p. 408.

53. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1023-24.

54. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 365-66.

55. BAV, Urb. lat., 842, ff. 774v-775r.

56. SAG, Estado, 882, no. 111; see A. von Druffel, Beiträge cited above, pp. 677-78.

57. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, p. 103.

58. Ibid., p. 46.

59. CT, vol. II, p. 262.

60. Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento cited above, vol. II, p. 866.

61. MiBA, Archivio Falcò Pio di Savoia, 491, int. 46.

62. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 889.

63. Mantova, BC, Carteggi, 4, Ippolito Capilupi, no. 294.

64. A. Santosuosso, An Account cited above, p. 491.

65. SAG, Estado, 882, no. 29 (the names of the two cardinals, "Carpi i Santiago," are written in cipher); the English summary of the letter is in CSP, Spain, vol. XIII, pp. 180-81.

66. "With tears in my eyes I write to Your Majesty that in this election it has not been possible to accomplish what your service required, which was the same as the service of God. As for me, nothing was left undone: with extreme exertion of mind and body every effort was made so that Your Majesty might be served. Would that others, who were as obliged as I to shed their blood in your service, had not failed" (SAG, Estado, 882, no. 95).

67. Ibid., no. 145.

68. Ibid., no. 112; see also no. 110.

69. Ibid., no. 30; the English summary of the letter is in CSP, Spain, vol. XIII, pp. 183-87; see Pastor, vol. VI, p. 343. On 31 May Manrique again wrote to Charles V to accuse Carpi and Álvarez once more (SAG, Estado, 882, no. 36).

70. SAG, Estado, 882, no. 111; see A. von Druffel, Beiträge cited above, vol. IV, pp. 677-78.

71. The pope, he wrote, "told me privately […] that even if there were here someone of the Spanish nation itself, he could not be more devoted or more useful to preserving the kingdom for Your Majesty; and he has ordered me to make this promise to Your Majesty, as I now do, and I believe he will prove so in fact" (SAG, Estado, 882, no. 154; see NB1, vol. XIII, p. 257, note).

72. SAG, Estado, 882, no. 151; see CSP, Spain, vol. XIII, pp. 181-83.

73. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 356 ff., 364 ff.; Id., Politica imperiale e vita religiosa cited above

74. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 623.

75. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 52, f. 66r.

76. A. Santosuosso, An Account cited above, pp. 494-95.

77. The credentials of 25 May stated that "las cosas del cónclavi han sido de manera que no basta scrivirlas" (SAG, Estado, 882, nos. 31, 32, 152; see no. 33, the text of the Instructione del cardinale camerlengo et del signor don Giovanni a Giovan Francesco Lottini; the English summary is in CSP, Spain, vol. XIII, pp. 187-88).

78. E. Bonora, Rome 1564 cited above, pp. 51-52.

79. FiAS, Mediceo, 3274, ff. 344v, 352v, 392r, letters of 22 and 28 August and 19 September 1555; see Legazioni di Averardo Serristori, cited above, p. 375.

80. CT, vol. XII, pp. 67-77; see A. Vanni, "Fare diligente inquisitione," cited above, pp. 141 ff.; idem, *La carriera di Paolo IV tra Inquisizione e ordini religiosi*, in "Tiempos modernos. Revista electrónica de Historia moderna," XXXVII (2018), pp. 411-33. On him and his pontificate, in addition to Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 346 ff., and Alberto Aubert, Paolo IV, papa, in DBI, vol. LXXXI, pp. 107-13, see also Gennaro Maria Monti, Ricerche su papa Paolo IV Carafa, Cooperativa tipografi-Chiostro di S. Sofia, Benevento 1925; René Ancel, *Paul IV et le concile*, in "Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique," VIII (1907), pp. 717-41; idem, *L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV. Le choix des cardinaux*, in "Revue des questions historiques," LXXXVI (1909), pp. 67-103; idem, La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa d'après des documents inédits (1559-1567), Maredsous 1909 (offprint from "Revue bénédictine," 1907-09); A. Aubert, *Alle origini della Controriforma*, cited above; idem, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione, cited above; Giampiero Brunelli, Il Sacro Consiglio di Paolo IV, Viella, Rome 2011.

81. BAV, Ottob. lat., 2684, f. 393r.

82. R. Ancel, *Paul IV et le concile*, cited above; Jedin, vol. III, pp. 30 ff.; A. Aubert, *Alle origini della Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 345 ff. On 14 March 1556 Bernardo Navagero reported to Venice that the pope intended to convene a council in Rome, "because," he had told him, "there is no need to go elsewhere, and we, as is well known, did not wish to give our vote that the council be held at Trent, one might say in the midst of the Lutherans, because the decision must be made by the bishops. Learned persons may indeed be admitted as advisers, but they must be Catholics; otherwise one might as well say that the Turk should also be admitted" (Daniele Santarelli, *La riforma della Chiesa di Paolo IV nello specchio delle lettere dell'ambasciatore veneziano Bernardo Navagero*, in "Annali dell'Istituto italiano per gli studi storici," XX [2003-2004], pp. 81-104, especially p. 94; see pp. 86-87). In 1560 Alvise Mocenigo would state that Paul IV's reforming zeal also arose from his desire to "correct abuses as far as he could, so that there would remain less occasion and necessity for holding a council" (Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 259).

83. S. Ricci, Il sommo inquisitore cited above, p. 111.

84. M. Firpo e F. Biferali, "Navicula Petri" cited above, p. 333.

85. Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento cited above, vol. II, pp. 746, 781, 798, 883, 900; see pp. 756, 761, 778, 784, 832, 838 e passim.

86. F. Negri, Tragedia cited above, pp. K2v, P3r.

87. V. Marucci (eds.), Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento cited above, p. 208.

88. P. Giovio, Lettere, cited above, vol. I, p. 231; see also p. 268.

89. BAV, Urb. lat., 1038, f. 68r; see also f. 72v.

90. Antonio Tabo, Copia di un'altra lettera […] mandata ad un suo amico, la quale racconta tutto il successo della felice coronatione del santissimo signor nostro Paulo per divina providentia IIII. pontefice massimo, appresso M. Valerio et Aluigi Dorici fratelli, in Rome [1555], p. [Aiii]rv.

91. Francesco Cancellieri, Storia de' solenni possessi de' sommi pontefici, detti anticamente processi o processioni, dopo la loro coronazione dalla basilica vaticana alla lateranense, presso Luigi Lazzarini stampatore della R.C.A., Rome 1802, pp. 107-8.

92. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, p. 46.

93. CT, vol. II, pp. 269-71.

94. Romeo De Maio, Alfonso Carafa. Cardinale di Napoli (1540-1565), Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1961, especially pp. 24 ff.

95. *Memorial de las cosas del papa Paulo quarto hecho por octubre de 1556* (SAG, Estado, 883, no. 46).

96. M. Firpo, Il cardinale, in Eugenio Garin (eds.), L'uomo del Rinascimento, Laterza, Roma-Bari 1988, pp. 73-131, see p. 103.

97. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, p. 33; ibid., vol. III, pp. 383-84.

98. FiAS, Mediceo, 3278, f. 210v.

99. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. III, pp. 378-82; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 346 ff.; Daniele Santarelli, Il papato di Paolo IV nella crisi politico-religiosa del Cinquecento. Le relazioni con la Repubblica di Venezia e l'atteggiamento nei confronti di Carlo V e Filippo II, Aracne, Rome 2008, pp. 31-34.

100. Ibid., p. 142.

101. VeAS, Miscellanea di atti diversi manoscritti, 134/5.

102. PM, vol. III, p. 164.

103. P. L. Bruzzone, Papa collerico e stravagante cited above, p. 433.

104. Briefe von Andreas Masius cited above, pp. 221-22; see pp. 234-35, 290.

105. BAV, Urb. lat. 1038, f. 68r.

106. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione cited above, p. 74.

107. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. III, p. 392.

108. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 625.

109. Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph cited above, p. 143.

110. D. Santarelli, *Il papato di Paolo IV*, cited above, pp. 64-65, 85, 99; for what follows as well, see ibid., pp. 41 ff., 68, 74, 95; Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 354 ff.

111. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. III, pp. 388-89, 409; see p. 391.

112. Pio Paschini, San Gaetano Thiene, Gian Pietro Carafa e le origini dei chierici regolari teatini, Scuola tipografica Pio X, Rome 1926, pp. 32 ff.; G. M. Monti, Studi sulla Riforma cattolica cited above, pp. 53-54; A. Vanni, "Fare diligente inquisitione" cited above, pp. 53 ff.; Id., Gaetano Thiene. Spiritualità, politica, santità, Viella, Rome 2016.

113. See above, section XII.2.

114. CT, vol. II, p. 286.

115. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 354 ff., 364 ff.; A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione cited above, pp. 77-78, 91-92; see pp. 56 ff.

116. APUG, ms 685rec., ff. 102r-103v.

117. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 64, f. 72rv.

118. NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 96-99, 194-202; for his correspondence with Dolfin, see pp. 208, 212-14, 231-34, 253-54, 257, 264-65, 281-82, 285-91, 300-2.

119. Ibid., p. 84.

120. Ibid., vol. XIII, p. 304, note 8.

121. Ibid., pp. 310-11.

122. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 390-94.

123. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione cited above, pp. 93-94, 100-1.

124. William McCuaig, Carlo Sigonio. The Changing World of the Late Renaissance, Princeton University Press, Princeton (NJ) 1989, p. 16; on Ragazzoni, it is enough to refer to Giampiero Brunelli, Ragazzoni, Girolamo, in DBI, vol. LXXXVI, pp. 160-64.

125. E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi cited above, pp. 75-76.

126. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 634.

127. See ibid., pp. 646-48.

128. Ibid., pp. 405-6; J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge cited above, vol. I, pp. 218-27; see P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole cited above, pp. 157-58; M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 262 ff.

129. See Pastor, vol. VI, p. 410; Fabio Gori, *Papa Paolo IV ed i Carafa suoi nepoti giudicati con nuovi documenti*, in “Archivio storico artistico archeologico e letterario della città e provincia di Roma,” I (1875), pp. 23-30, 193-256; II (1877), pp. 47-63, 170-206, 257-65, 302-21, especially pp. 208 ff.

130. NB1, vol. XV, pp. 291-92.

131. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, p. 99; see M. Firpo, Sulla legazione di pace cited above

132. NB1, vol. XV, p. 316.

133. Ibid., p. 298.

134. Ibid., pp. 319-22; the passages concerning the Inquisition in the Habsburg dominions omitted here may be read in Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 104-5.

135. NB1, vol. XV, pp. 326-27.

136. See his letters to Paul IV in Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 11 ff.

137. NB1, vol. XV, p. 331.

138. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 397 ff.

139. NB1, vol. XV, p. 331.

140. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 646-47.

141. See above, section XV.4; CT, vol. II, pp. 303, 307.

142. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, pp. 47-48.

143. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 651, and more generally pp. 421 ff.; CT, vol. II, pp. 287 ff.; vol. XIII/1, pp. 317 ff.; R. Ancel, *L’activité réformatrice de Paul IV*, cited above; A. Aubert, *Alle origini della Controriforma*, cited above, pp. 343 ff. The measures examined by G. Brunelli, *Il Sacro Consiglio di Paolo IV*, cited above, concern only the government of Rome.

144. G. Ribier, Lettres et memoires d’Estat cited above, vol. II, pp. 791, 824; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 454 ff.; R. Ancel, La disgrâce cited above, pp. 28 ff.

145. H. Seripandi, *Diarium de vita sua*, cited above, pp. 109, 209; see CT, vol. II, pp. 449, 459. On the weakness of Paul IV's reforming action, see E. Bonora, "Come s'egli non fusse al mondo," cited above.

146. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 633.

147. OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 70r-75v.

148. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, p. 99.

149. NB1, vol. XV, p. 317.

150. APUG, ms 685rec., ff. 102r-103v.

151. D. Santarelli, La riforma della Chiesa di Paolo IV cited above, pp. 93-94.

152. Ibid., pp. 83-86.

153. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 422 ff., 633 ff.; Jedin, vol. II, pp. 27 ff.

154. D. Santarelli, La riforma della Chiesa di Paolo IV cited above, pp. 91-92.

155. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione cited above, p. 32; M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana cited above, pp. 360-61.

156. R. Ancel, L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV cited above, p. 73, note 1.

157. CT, vol. II, p. 285; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 438-40.

158. BAV, Urb. lat., 1038, f. 204v. On the question, see the weak studies by R. Ancel, *L'activité réformatrice de Paul IV*, cited above, *and Paul IV et le concile*, cited above; A. V. Antonovics, *Counter-Reformation Cardinals*, cited above.

159. Briefe von Andreas Masius cited above, p. 235.

160. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, f. 136v.

161. A. Aubert, Alle origini della Controriforma cited above, pp. 349-50.

162. BAV, Urb. lat., 1038, f. 359v (Roman newsletter of 31 December 1558). On the day the congregation met, the Este ambassador wrote in June 1559, "there is no room for other business" (MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 56); see Pastor, vol. VI, p. 660; Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, vol. IV, p. 49; R. Ancel, *La disgrâce*, cited above, pp. 24-25.

163. In addition to Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 478 ff.; see also idem, *Allgemeine Dekrete*, cited above (to be supplemented with the list of decrees preserved in Milan, ACV, section XIV, vol. 246); it is enough to refer to A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, pp. 135 ff.

164. P. Canisii, *Epistulae et acta* cited above, vol. II, p. 380; see Pastor, vol. VI, p. 380.

165. In addition to the studies by Attilio Milano, Storia degli ebrei in Italia, Einaudi, Turin 1963, pp. 247 ff., and Il ghetto di Roma, Staderini, Rome 1964, and by Marina Caffiero, Storia degli Ebrei nell'Italia moderna. Dal Rinascimento alla Restaurazione, Carocci, Rome 2014, see Adriano Prosperi, L'Inquisizione romana e gli ebrei, in Michele Luzzati, ed., L'Inquisizione e gli ebrei in Italia, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1994, pp. 67-120, especially pp. 77 ff.; Anna Foa and Kenneth Stow, Gli ebrei di Roma. Potere, rituale e società in età moderna, in Luigi Fiorani and Adriano Prosperi, eds., Roma, la città del papa. Vita civile e religiosa dal giubileo di Bonifacio VIII al giubileo di papa Wojtyła (Storia d'Italia. Annali, XVI, Einaudi, Turin 2000), pp. 557-81, especially pp. 566 ff.

166. A. Caracciolo, *Vita et gesti di Giovan Pietro Carafa*, cited above, f. 426v; on Caracciolo and his troubled Life of Pope Carafa, see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 537 ff.

167. CT, vol. XIII/1, p. 327.

168. D. Santarelli, La riforma della Chiesa di Paolo IV cited above, p. 90.

169. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti cited above, vol. IV, p. 48.

170. A. Aubert, Paolo IV, Politica, Inquisizione cited above, p. 13.

171. PM, vol. III, pp. 190-92.

172. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, p. 268.

173. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 128-29; see p. 16.

174. A. Mercati, I costituti di Niccolò Franco cited above, p. 228; Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento cited above, vol. II, pp. 907-8; Pasquino. Cinquecento pasquinate, edited by Ferdinando Silenzi e Renato Silenzi, II ed., Bompiani, Milan 1932, p. 258.

175. PM, vol. III, pp. 34-35.

176. Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 217-18; see P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole cited above, pp. 156 ff.

177. PM, vol. III, p. 139; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 315 ff. Gianpiero Brunelli's thesis in Paolo IV, le Riforme della Curia, gli "Spirituali": interrelazioni, riposizionamenti, in "Tiempos modernos. Revista electrónica de Historia moderna," XXXVII (2018), pp. 324-40, according to which forms of collaboration between Pope Carafa and the spirituali were not lacking in an initial phase, appears very unconvincing.

178. On the restoration of Catholicism in England and Pole's last years, see T. F. Mayer, *Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 252 ff.; David Michael Loades, The Reign of Mary Tudor. Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-1558, St. Martin's Press, New York 1979; Eamon Duffy and David Loades, eds., The Church of Mary Tudor, Ashgate, Aldershot 2006; Eamon Duffy, Fires of Faith. Catholic England under Mary Tudor, Yale University Press, New Haven-London 2009; the monograph by J. Edwards, *Archbishop Pole*, cited above, is strongly apologetic in inspiration; see also John Edwards and Ronald Truman, eds., Reforming Catholicism in the England of Mary Tudor. The Achievement of Friar Bartolomé Carranza, Ashgate, Aldershot 2005.

179. See Pastor, vol. VI, p. 409; see P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 147 ff.; F. Gui, *L'attesa del concilio*, cited above, and idem, *Il papato e i Colonna*, cited above; M. Firpo, *Politica imperiale e vita religiosa*, cited above; idem, Riforma della Chiesa ed eresie nell'età di Carlo V. Riflessi spagnoli in Italia, now in idem, *Valdesiani e spirituali*, cited above, pp. 91-108.

180. Manuel Fernández Álvarez, Carlos V, el César y el Hombre, Espasa Forum, Madrid 1999, pp. 773, 842-45; see Corpus documental de Carlos V, edited by Manuel Fernández Álvarez, 5 vols., Consejo superior de investigaciones cientificas, Salamanca 1973-81, vol. IV, pp. 424-25.

XVI. "The Pope Is Busy Filling the Prisons with Cardinals and Bishops." The Trial.

1. ELISEO MASINI, Sacro arsenale, overo prattica dell'officio della santa Inquisitione, per Gioseffo Longhi, Bologna 1679 [I ed. 1621], pp. 24 ff., 30 ff.

2. Ibid., p. 30.

3. Castrucci's work is published as an appendix to Andrea Errera, Processus in causa fidei. L'evoluzione dei manuali inquisitoriali nei secoli XVI-XVIII e il manuale inedito di un inquisitore perugino, Manduzzi, Bologna 2000, pp. 324-25.

4. See above, section XII.4.

5. PM, vol. II, p. 724.

6. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 51-53.

7. Ibid., pp. 54 ff.

8. E. MASINI, Sacro arsenale cited above, p. 106.

9. Paris, Archives Nationales, L. 388 (Inventaire des fonds des diverses dicastères pontificaux notamment congrégations du Saint Office et Datarie. 1457-1809). On the transfer of the inquisitorial archive to Paris

during the Napoleonic era, see John Tedeschi, *La dispersione degli archivi della Inquisizione romana*, in "Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa," IX (1973), pp. 298-312, now in idem, Il giudice e l'eretico. Studi sull'Inquisizione romana, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1997, pp. 35-46.

10. PM, vol. I, pp. 318 ff.; on him, see above, section VII.3.

11. PM, vol. I, pp. 393 ff.

12. Ibid., pp. 795 ff.

13. See above, section XII.4.

14. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1; see also the letter of 1 February of that year in which Gualteruzzi informed Beccadelli of Filippo Gheri's transfer to Novara, where, he commented, "it seems to me that at present he is better off than in Rome" (OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 70r-75v).

15. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 2557, sub data.

16. G. Caravale, Predicazione e Inquisizione cited above, pp. 127 ff.

17. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], *Catalogo del Arcimboldo, arcivescovo di Milano*, ove egli condanna et diffama per heretici la maggior parte de' figliuoli de Dio et membri de Christo i quali ne' loro scritti cercano la riformatione della Chiesa cristiana, s. l. [but C. Mylius, Strasbourg 1554], pp. E4v-F6r.

18. See above, section X.2 and note 68.

19. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. 16-17.

20. On them, see above, section III.3.

21. Cesare Cantú, Gli eretici d'Italia. Discorsi storici, 3 vols., Unione tipografico-editrice, Turin 1865-67, vol. II, p. 168.

22. M. Al Kalak, L'eresia dei fratelli cited above, pp. 85 ff.

23. PM, vol. I, pp. 1085 ff.

24. The records of his inquisitorial trial are published ibid., pp. 1157 ff.

25. Ibid., vol. III, p. 127 and note 4; see p. 128, note 5.

26. Ibid., pp. 147-48.

27. Ibid., pp. 131-32.

28. Alessandro Paris, "When I Read a Book or Hear a Sermon, I Take What Is Good and Can Be Edifying." I libri del cardinal Morone e il suo processo inquisitoriale, *in L'uomo del concilio*, cited above, pp. 65-81.

29. PM, vol. III, pp. 128-29; see pp. 136-37; for what follows, see also the summary reconstruction in A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 101 ff.

30. PM, vol. III, pp. 132-35; see p. 129.

31. Ibid., p. 139.

32. CT, vol. II, p. 310.

33. PM, vol. III, pp. 155-56.

34. Ibid., pp. 171-72.

35. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1038.

36. Ibid., p. 1260.

37. Ibid., p. 1294.

38. Ibid., p. 928.

39. Ibid., p. 1085.

40. Ibid., pp. 1016-18.

41. Ibid., vol. III, p. 138.

42. Ibid., p. 151.

43. Ibid., p. 145.

44. Ibid., pp. 146-47.

45. Ibid., pp. 158-60; see pp. 162-63.

46. Ibid., p. 173.

47. Ibid., p. 158.

48. Ibid., pp. 157, 161, 169-70.

49. Ibid., p. 179.

50. CT, vol. II, p. 313.

51. PM, vol. III, p. 163.

52. Ibid., pp. 141, 148-50 and note 83.

53. Giulio Coggiola, *I Farnesi e il ducato di Parma e Piacenza durante il pontificato di Paolo IV*, in "Archivio storico per le provincie parmensi", III (1903), pp. 1-232; Pastor, vol. VI, p. 420.

54. PM, vol. III, pp. 178-79; see Gigliola Fragnito, Memoria individuale e costruzione biografica. Beccadelli, Della Casa, Vettori alle origini di un mito, Argalia, Urbino 1978, pp. 42-43.

55. PM, vol. III, p. 140.

56. Ibid., pp. 184, note 207, 188-89. On 24 September 1558 Sforza Morone also warmly recommended the cause of his cardinal brother to Alessandro Farnese (ibid., p. 251).

57. Ibid., p. 165.

58. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 3, letter from Elvangen of 5 August 1557; see also ibid., the letter of 2 September, in which Truchsess advised Farnese to write to him by way of Mantua rather than Venice, now convinced "that your letters and mine together are either being held back or going astray." "It is certain," he informed him in allusive words on 15 December 1557, "that my entire plan was directed toward going to Rome, but the ever-greater impediments presented to me by the care of my diocese make me decide for the present to postpone that journey; moreover, I understand that along this road some mountains of snow have fallen so great that they have closed the pass, so that one could not go to Rome without danger until a spring comes when so many thick humors will have melted" (ibid., 87).

59. PM, vol. III, pp. 168-69.

60. Ibid., p. 178.

61. Ibid., p. 188.

62. Ibid., pp. 164-65.

63. Ibid., pp. 142-43, 145, 155-56.

64. ASV, Arch. concistoriale. Acta vicecancellarii, 8, f. 151v.

65. PM, vol. III, p. 271.

66. Ibid., p. 149.

67. Ibid., pp. 151, 154-55.

68. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 400-3.

69. Ibid., vol. III, p. 151.

70. A. Errera, Processus in causa fidei cited above, pp. 334-35.

71. PM, vol. I, p. 407.

72. Ibid., pp. 400 ff.

73. Ibid., pp. 407-9.

74. Ibid., pp. 427-28.

75. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 156, 159, 161.

76. Ibid., p. 175; see pp. 177-79.

77. Ibid., p. 176.

78. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 475 ff., 486 ff., 505 ff., 521 ff., 535 ff.

79. Ibid., pp. 500 ff.

80. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 413 ff.

81. PM, vol. III, p. 172.

82. J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, Pole y Paulo IV cited above, pp. 232-33.

83. Ibid., p. 226; see T. F. Mayer, Reginald Pole cited above, pp. 316 ff.

84. PM, vol. III, pp. 179-80.

85. Ibid., pp. 180-82 and note 195.

86. Ibid., pp. 182, 189-92.

87. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 541 ff.

88. See above, section XIV.5.

89. Processi Davidico, p. 105.

90. Ibid., p. 113; see also pp. 117 ff., 122 ff., 156-57.

91. Ibid., p. 118; see pp. XLI-XLV.

92. Ibid., p. 115; see p. 116, which shows that the letter bore the date “at the baths, 19 June 1555”; see also the following pages and p. 134.

93. PM, vol. II, pp. 138 ff.

94. Lorenzo Davidico, *Laberintho di pazzi*, per gli heredi di Gioanne Padovano, in Venetia 1555 (though the colophon bears the date 1556), pp. Aiiv-Aiiir; see also p. Diiiirv.

95. Ibid., p. [Gv]v.

96. Ibid., p. Ciiir; see also p. Cr.

97. On him, it is enough to refer to Adolfo Giuliani, Pontano (Pontani), Guglielmo, in Dizionario biografico dei giuristi italiani, edited by Italo Birocchi, Ennio Cortese, Antonello Mattone, and Marco Nicola Miletti, 2 vols., il Mulino, Bologna 2013, vol. I, p. 1615.

98. Processi Davidico, pp. 94 ff.

99. Ibid., p. 146.

100. Ibid., p. LIV, note 235.

101. Ibid., pp. 139-40; see also pp. 134, 139-40, 328.

102. On 15 October the superior general of the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul, Gian Pietro Besozzi, was informed from Rome that Davidico had been imprisoned at Ripetta (AGB, M.b.57, no. 15; see O. Premoli, *Lorenzo Davidico*, cited above, pp. 185-87).

103. Processi Davidico, pp. 167-68.

104. Ibid., pp. 106 ff.

105. Ibid., p. 109: “I watched him closely, and in the two or three months that I served him I heard various words from His Lordship which, because of my suspicion, I interpreted unfavorably.”

106. Ibid., pp. 116 ff., 121 ff.

107. Ibid., pp. 369 ff. Don Lorenzo himself wished to emphasize the close “union” he had had with Lachi, “taking his advice and opinion in many things,” while also stressing that Lachi had been the one to take the initiative in speaking to him about the troubling rumors concerning Morone’s and Bertano’s orthodoxy (ibid., p. 123).

108. PM, vol. I, pp. 138 ff.

109. Processi Davidico, pp. 120 ff.: “I do indeed suspect,” he would later add in the deposition of 16 October, “that [Lachi] may have added something of his own in reporting the matter and that he may harbor some resentment against the most reverend Morone, because when I entered his service he spoke very badly of him to me” (ibid., p. 136).

110. Ibid., pp. 126-29.

111. Ibid., p. 134; see also the following pages.

112. Ibid., pp. 142 ff.

113. Ibid., pp. 147 ff.

114. APSB, Cartella gialla, XXXIX; see O. Premoli, Lorenzo Davidico cited above, p. 282.

115. Processi Davidico, pp. 164, 169-70.

116. Ibid., pp. 243 ff., 300 ff.

117. Ibid., pp. 182, 189 ff., 196 ff.

118. Ibid., pp. 160, 162.

119. Even in his deposition of 5 October 1556 Davidico said he was worried “that Monsignor Morone may have been told that I testified against him, or that, knowing I am here, he may have suspected that I testified against him, and consequently that His Most Reverend Lordship, together with his household adherents [of heresy], may be hostile to me” (ibid., p. 264).

120. Ibid., p. 199.

121. APSB, Cartella gialla, XXXIX; see ibid., the similar reports of 14 and 20 November: “No other help can be given him; one can only pray that the Lord may have mercy”; see O. Premoli, *Lorenzo Davidico*, cited above, p. 282.

122. Processi Davidico, pp. 248 ff., especially pp. 252, 258-59.

123. Ibid., pp. 272-73.

124. Ibid., pp. 266 ff., 271 ff.

125. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. I, f. 200r.

126. Processi Davidico, pp. 292 ff.

127. Ibid., pp. 306-17.

128. Ibid., p. 318.

129. “The former prisoner,” Pancaldi wrote on 3 June, “returned, as I already wrote, on 30 May. The Lord will grant him his aid. He has been sent back to where he was before” (APSB, Cartella gialla, XXXIX; see O. Premoli, *Lorenzo Davidico*, cited above, p. 286).

130. Ibid., p. 325.

131. Ibid., pp. 331 ff.

132. Ibid., pp. 336 ff.

133. Ibid., pp. 352 ff.

134. See below, section XVII.2.

135. For what follows, see also the interrogations of Don Rocco Pupeto of 13 and 16 July 1560, included in the file concerning Paolo and Alvise Dal Corno and Davidico's flight, preserved in VeAS, Santo Uffizio, 15. Pupeto stated, among other things, that he had learned from the bookseller Giovanni Padovano, who in 1556 had published Davidico's *Laberintho di pazzi*, "that he had been detained on account of the most reverend Cardinal Morone, but I do not know for what reason"; see O. Premoli, *Lorenzo Davidico*, cited above, pp. 288-89.

136. PM, vol. II, pp. 110 ff., 115 ff., 806 ff.

137. Carlo Marcora, Nicolò Ormaneto vicario di san Carlo (giugno 1564-giugno 1566), in Memorie storiche della diocesi di Milano, vol. VIII, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milan 1961, pp. 209-590, especially pp. 536-38.

138. Lorenzo Davidico, Tractatulus de cellae verae Veneris laudibus, per Laurentium Pasquatum, Patavii 1568, pp. 10v-11r.

139. Giorgio Tibaldeschi, *Eretici a Vercelli*, in "Bollettino storico vercellese," XIII (1984), pp. 5-46, especially p. 31, note 104.

140. APSB, Cartella gialla, XXXIV; letters transcribed by Angelo Maria Cortenovis, Memorie per la vita di Lorenzo Davidico, ms Rome, AGB, Y. b. 37; see M. Firpo, *Nel labirinto del mondo*, cited above, pp. 224 ff.

141. PM, vol. I, pp. 541 ff., 548 ff.

142. Ibid., pp. 1085-104.

143. E. Masini, Sacro arsenale cited above, p. 106.

144. Ibid., pp. 116-17.

145. PM, vol. III, p. 184; see p. 183.

146. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 557 ff.

147. Ibid., pp. 550 ff.

148. Ibid., pp. 607 ff.

149. Ibid., vol. III, p. 186.

150. Ibid., pp. 187-88.

151. Ibid., p. 185; see pp. 188, 193.

152. Ibid., p. 198, note 265; see also pp. 200, 202; see the *Istruzione del cardinal Caraffa pel vescovo di Terracina*, dated in Brussels on 5 January 1558, in P. Nores, *Storia della guerra di Paolo IV*, cited above, pp. 437-41, especially p. 439.

153. Fresneda himself would make this claim in the testimony he gave against Carranza at Valladolid on 6 October 1559, stating that in Brussels he had seen the records of the proceedings against Pole and Morone, which, on the basis of a great many depositions, had unequivocally documented their heresies (J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Fray Bartolomé Carranza. Documentos históricos*, cited above, vol. II/2, p. 563; see Id., *Pole, Carranza y Fresneda. Cara y cruz de una amistad y de una enemistad*, in Id., *Fray Bartolomé Carranza y el cardenal Pole*, cited above, pp. 119-97, especially pp. 159 ff.); P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 169 ff., 187 ff.; M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 82-83.

154. J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Pole, Carranza y Fresneda*, cited above, pp. 138-39, 171.

155. PM, vol. III, p. 300; see also ibid., note 380.

156. See Pole's letter of congratulations to Carranza of 28 September 1557 in J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Pole, Carranza y Fresneda*, cited above, pp. 188-89.

157. PM, vol. III, pp. 189-90.

158. Ibid., pp. 196, 202-3.

159. See above, section XI.1.

160. PM, vol. III, pp. 199-200 and note 269, 203-4; P. Simoncelli, *Il caso Reginald Pole*, cited above, pp. 187 ff.

161. J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Pole, Carranza y Fresneda*, cited above, pp. 178-81.

162. PM, vol. III, p. 208 and note 314, Ribadeneira's letter of 24 March 1558 announcing Salmerón's departure for Rome, where he would report orally on the intervention on Morone's behalf.

163. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1095-97.

164. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 193-94.

165. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 574 ff.

166. Ibid., pp. 599 ff.

167. PM, vol. III, p. 197 and note 260.

168. CT, vol. II, p. 321.

169. PM, vol. III, pp. 219-20; see also p. 197, note 260.

170. Ibid., p. 200.

171. Ibid., pp. 205-6.

172. Ibid., pp. 209-11; see ibid., pp. 220-22.

173. Ibid., pp. 203-4.

174. Ibid., p. 231.

175. Ibid., pp. 211-18; Pole, Epistolae, vol. V, pp. 31-36.

176. PM, vol. III, pp. 233-46; see P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole, cited above, pp. 183 ff., 253 ff.

177. Ibid., pp. 208, 219-20, 224-25; a month later, however, on 11 June, the protonotary wrote to her that "there are good hopes for Morone" (ibid., p. 227).

178. Ibid., p. 226; see M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 276-78.

179. PM, vol. III, p. 252, note 434.

180. Ibid., p. 285, note 537.

181. Ibid., pp. 253 ff.; see vol. I, pp. 1265 ff.; M. Al Kalak, Il riformatore dimenticato, cited above, pp. 177 ff.

182. PM, vol. I, pp. 729 ff., 755 ff., 768 ff.

183. Ibid., vol. III, p. 247; for his abjuration, see p. 725, note b.

184. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 1263, 1273.

185. Ibid., pp. 749 ff., 781 ff.

186. Ibid., pp. 250-51; see pp. 248 ff.

187. Massimo Carlo Giannini, Fortune e sfortune di un ambasciatore: il fallimento della missione a Roma di Juan de Figueroa (1558-1559), in Maria Antonietta Visceglia (edited by), Diplomazia e politica della Spagna a Roma. Figure di ambasciatori, in "Roma moderna e contemporanea", XV (2007), pp. 95-129.

188. PM, vol. III, pp. 252-53.

189. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1930, Madruzzo's letter to Ercole Gonzaga of 21 April 1558.

190. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, pp. XX-XXIII. It was the Cardinal of Trent who had asked him to act in this way (see his letters of 11 April 1558 to Carlo Carafa and Antonio Elio in Theodor Brieger, *Aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken. Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte*, in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, V [1882], pp. 574-622, especially pp. 584, 612-13). The letter by which the Florentine protonotary had been recommended from Venice to Madruzzo on 22 March as "a creature of the most illustrious Cardinal Pole and very close to Morone," cited by Pastor, vol. VI, p. 498, note 4, is in TnAS, Corrispondenza Madruzziana, 1558. On the position adopted by the cardinal-nephew for private reasons, independently of the pope's wishes, even to the point of making a few tentative efforts to help Morone "in order to fulfill the promise made to the king of Spain," see Carnesecchi's letter to Gonzaga of 14 May (*Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. I, p. 328). For the fleeting hopes entertained by the scattered friends of the Milanese cardinal upon Carafa's return to Italy, see also Beccadelli's letter to Ugolino Gualteruzzi of 18 May (PM, vol. III, pp. 224-25, note 361). Cosimo de' Medici too, writing from Pisa to his resident in Rome on 13 March 1558, said that he could not "believe that His Holiness, upon the return of the most illustrious Monsignor Carafa with so favorable an outcome, will fail to show clemency toward Cardinal Morone and himself" (ibid., pp. 206-7).

191. PM, vol. III, pp. 248-50.

192. Ibid., vol. I, p. 473; see above, section XVI.2.

XVII. "Morone Will Be Released Once His Holiness Has Closed His Eyes." From Paul IV to Pius IV

1. PM, vol. III, pp. 256-57.

2. Ibid., pp. 263, 265, 268-70.

3. Ibid., pp. 272, 276-77.

4. Ibid., p. 271.

5. Ibid., pp. 267-68.

6. Ibid., pp. 278 ff. The text is in *Bullarium diplomatum*, cited above, vol. VI, pp. 551-56; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 508-9, and the observations of E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 150 ff.

7. "This bull is judged to concern Morone's case more than anything else," Bernardino Pia wrote on 15 February (PM, vol. III, p. 281). Shortly afterward, a report of 8 April stated that "everything is believed to have been done chiefly to deprive Cardinal Morone so discreetly that he can never be promoted to the pontificate" (ibid., p. 291; see also pp. 282-84 and notes 527, 530).

8. Ibid., pp. 284-85; see also pp. 285-87.

9. Ibid., p. 290.

10. Ibid., p. 288.

11. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. 26 ff.

12. PM, vol. III, p. 296, note 575.

13. Ibid., p. 293; see also ibid., note 564.

14. Ibid., pp. 294-95; see p. 296.

15. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 791 ff.

16. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 295-97.

17. Ibid., pp. 258, 297.

18. Ibid., pp. 311, 315-17, 322.

19. Ibid., p. 294, note 565.

20. Ibid., p. 326 (the text of the *consiglietti* is published in ibid., vol. II, p. 95); see Pia's reply of 28 July (ibid., vol. III, pp. 329-30). The day after his absolution, on 6 April 1560, Morone wrote to Gonzaga to thank him for the great help he had provided during his painful inquisitorial ordeal (ibid., pp. 429-30).

21. Ibid., vol. III, p. 341.

22. See the anonymous opinion on how the defensive phase of the trial should be conducted, sent to Girolamo da Correggio and preserved among Alessandro Farnese's papers, which should be dated to these weeks (ibid., pp. 310-11).

23. Ibid., pp. 325-26.

24. Ibid., p. 296 and note 575.

25. Ibid., pp. 299-300; see p. 297.

26. Ibid., pp. 297-98 and note 580.

27. Ibid., pp. 299-301; see note 584.

28. Ibid., vol. I, p. 1105.

29. Ibid., vol. III, p. 299, note 585.

30. Ibid., p. 303.

31. Ibid., pp. 306-8 (the italics are in cipher in the original).

32. Ibid., pp. 302-5; see vol. II, pp. 3 ff.

33. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 311-14; see 1559; see also p. 318. On the two lawyers, see vol. II, p. 11, notes 52 and 54.

34. E. Masini, Sacro arsenale, cited above, pp. 120 ff.; see PM, vol. II, pp. 3 ff.; for what follows, see also A. P. Robinson, The Career, cited above, pp. 106 ff.

35. Cesare Carena, *Tractatus de Officio Sanctissimae Inquisitionis et modo procedendi in causis fidei*, sumptibus Laurentii Anisson, Lugduni 1669, p. 319 (earlier editions of this work had appeared at Cremona in 1642 and 1655, Lyon in 1649, and Bologna in 1668); see also E. Masini, *Sacro arsenale*, cited above, p. 132, where the chapter devoted to the *Modo di esaminare i testimoni a difesa de' rei* concludes "by saying that, since the right of defense derives from natural law, a defense must be granted not only to an accused person who has neither been convicted nor confessed before torture and sentence, but also to one who has been convicted and confessed, and counsel must in every way be heard on his behalf."

36. E. Masini, Sacro arsenale, cited above, p. 122.

37. PM, vol. III, p. 307.
38. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 7-8.
39. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 304-5; see also pp. 305-6.
40. Ibid., pp. 306, 309.
41. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 8-13; vol. III, pp. 311-14; see above, section XVII.1.
42. PM, vol. III, p. 327, note 676.
43. See above, section XVII.2.
44. PM, vol. II, pp. 16 ff.
45. Ibid., vol. III, p. 324.
46. Ibid., pp. 305-6.
47. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 21 ff.
48. Ibid., pp. 32 ff.
49. Ibid., pp. 61 ff.
50. Ibid., vol. III, p. 326.
51. Ibid., p. 323.
52. Ibid., pp. 327-28.
53. Ibid., pp. 328-29.
54. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 121 ff.
55. Ibid., pp. 67 ff.
56. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 329-31.
57. Ibid., pp. 330, note 687, 331.
58. Ibid., p. 333.
59. PrAS, Epistolario scelto, 7.
60. FiAS, Mediceo, 2972, f. 176v.
61. PrAS, Epistolario scelto, 6.
62. Trento, BC, ms 2900, f. 76v (n. 112).
63. PM, vol. III, pp. 297-98, note 580; 305, note 605; 330, note 687, Caracciolo's letters of 3 and 14 June and 28 July; see the *Relación de cinco cartas del cardenal de Siguença a Su Magestad de 18, 21, 23, 27 de agosto 1559* (ibid., pp. 348-49, note 752); M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 323 ff.
64. PM, vol. III, pp. 334-35; see Ricardo de Hinojosa, Felipe II y el cónclave de 1559, Tipografía de Manuel Ginés Hernández, Madrid 1889, pp. 45-46.
65. PM, vol. III, pp. 334-35; M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 336 ff.
66. PM, vol. III, pp. 261, 283, 314.
67. Ibid., pp. 336-37 and note 709.
68. Ibid., p. 336.
69. Ibid., pp. 336-37.
70. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1679, *Ritratto delle cose di Roma delli 2 settembre*, sent from Milan to Mantua on 15 September.
71. See, for example, Cino Campani, *In laudem Pauli IIII pontificis optimi maximi oratio*, impressit Bidellus Alexis, Romae 1555, p. [Eiiii]v; see M. Firpo and F. Biferali, *Navicula Petri*, cited above, pp. 262 ff.

72. BAV, Urb. lat., 1039, f. 1v.

73. CT, vol. II, pp. 332-33.

74. On him see PM, vol. III, p. 522, note 846.

75. ACDF, Stanza storica, I 4-b, f. 94r.

76. PM, vol. III, p. 338, note 714; see Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 585-86.

77. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, p. 689.

78. FiAS, Mediceo, 3279, f. 332v.

79. COLA COLEINE, Diario dall'anno 1521 fino all'anno 1561, ms BAV, Ottob. Lat., 2603, vol. II, ff. 274r-312v, see ff. 307v-309r.

80. Ibid.; see Salvatore Caponetto, *Due relazioni inedite dell'ambasciatore Montino Del Monte al duca d'Urbino sugli avvenimenti romani dopo la morte di Paolo IV*, in *Studia Oliveriana*, I (1953), pp. 25-40; Roberto Rezzaghi, *Cronaca di un conclave: l'elezione di Pio IV (1559)*, in *Salesianum*, XLVIII (1986), pp. 539-81, especially pp. 547-50; CT, vol. II, pp. 333, 515-16, 607-8; *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 36-38; and the version supplied by A. Caracciolo, *Vita et gesti di Giovan Pietro Carafa*, cited above, f. 489r, which is substantially identical to Belo's.

81. FiAS, Urbino, I. G. 134, f. 456r.

82. R. Rezzaghi, Cronaca di un conclave, cited above, p. 549.

83. On him see PM, vol. I, p. 72, note 36.

84. Ibid., vol. III, p. 340 and note 722.

85. FiAS, Urbino, I. G. 134, f. 456v.

86. C. Coleine, Diario, cited above, ff. 307v-309r.

87. CT, vol. II, pp. 333-34.

88. Antonella Pampalone, La statua capitolina di Paolo IV Carafa tra arte e storia. Il restauro di Vincenzo Felice e altri interventi settecenteschi, in "Annali della Pontificia insigne Accademia di Belle arti e lettere dei Virtuosi al Pantheon", IV (2004), pp. 199- 243, in part. pp. 199 ff.

89. C. Coleine, Diario, cited above, ff. 307v-309v; see R. Rezzaghi, Cronaca di un conclave, cited above, p. 550; see also Massarelli's account in CT, vol. II, p. 333.

90. Pastor, vol. VI, p. 586, note 1.

91. R. De Maio, Alfonso Carafa, cited above, pp. 79-80 and note 6; S. Caponetto, Due relazioni inedite, cited above, pp. 18-19.

92. C. Coleine, Diario, cited above, ff. 307v-309r.

93. A. Mercati, I costituti di Niccolò Franco, cited above, p. 128.

94. a. Caracciolo, Vita et gesti di Giovan Pietro Carafa, cited above, ff. 494v-495r.

95. R. De Maio, Alfonso Carafa, cited above, pp. 81-82; S. Caponetto, Due relazioni inedite, cited above, p. 16.

96. C. Coleine, Diario, cited above, ff. 307v-309r.

97. CT, vol. II, p. 337.

98. Giovanni Paolo Flavio, *Oratio in funere Pauli IIII pontificis maximi*, ex officina Matthiae Cancer, Neapoli 1560; see R. De Maio, *Alfonso Carafa*, cited above, pp. 82-83, who emphasizes that Flavio was handsomely rewarded.

99. Iulii Pogiani Sunensis, Epistolae et orationes, olim collectae ab Antonio Maria Gratiano, nunc ab Hieronymo Lagomarsinio e Societate Iesu adnotationibus illustratae ac primum editae, 4 vols., Generosus Salomonius, Romae 1756-62, vol. I, pp. 310-24, in part. pp. 315, 320.

100. Juvenal, *Satires*, VI, 223: "Sic volo, sic iubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas" [Thus I will it, thus I command it; let my will stand in place of reason].

101. PM, vol. III, pp. 365-68.

102. See above, section XVII.1.

103. Alvise Mocenigo wrote this in his report from Rome of 1560 (*Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 38); see Angelo Massarelli's diary in CT, vol. II, p. 352.

104. Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 12-14.

105. Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento, cited above, vol. II, pp. 906, 909.

106. Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento, cited above, p. 261.

107. Ibid., pp. 247-48, 269; see also pp. 170, 187.

108. PM, vol. III, pp. 339-40.

109. Ibid., pp. 341-44.

110. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 131 ff.

111. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 350-51; see pp. 343 ff.

112. Ibid., pp. 345, 347; Onofrio Panvinio would also write that the Sacred College's decision was reached "13 absolventibus 11 condemnantibus" [thirteen voting to absolve and eleven to condemn] (ibid., p. 344).

113. Ibid., pp. 344-47.

114. Ibid., p. 355.

115. Ibid., p. 348.

116. Ibid., pp. 355-56.

117. Ibid., pp. 345 ff., 357, 363, 381; see also pp. 381-82, 384, the letters of 18 October and 12 November, which grew increasingly pessimistic about the Milanese cardinal's prospects.

118. Ibid., p. 359.

119. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 885, 935; especially pp. 918 ("Morone declares he'll be a good Christian | if they make him pope"), 941, 946 ("'Do you want us to make Morone pope?' 'No, devil, for he has been investigated: | you know full well he was in the Castle, | though he wears his hair like a hermit'"); for other, more general references to the Milanese cardinal, see ibid., pp. 597, 654, 747, 777-78, 782, 784-85, 808, 832, 839, 867, 917, 938, 951.

120. Leandro Perini, Note e documenti su Pietro Perna libraio-tipografo a Basilea, in "Nuova rivista storica", L (1966), pp. 145-200, see p. 191; see also p. 193.

121. B. McClung Hallman, Italian Cardinals, cited above, p. 108.

122. See also CT, vol. II, pp. 334-35, 518; Francesco Cristofori, Il pontificato di Paolo IV ed i Caraffa suoi nipoti, presso l'autore-tipografia S. Bernardino editrice, Roma-Siena 1888, p. 130.

123. PM, vol. III, pp. 355-56; see p. 346, note 745.

124. Ibid., p. 359.

125. Carnesecchi described him in these terms in a letter to Donna Giulia of 23 September 1559 (ibid., p. 376).

126. Ibid., pp. 371-72; see also p. 373, the *Summario delle polize uscite del conclavi infino alli 16 di settembre*, and p. 370, Gualteruzzi's letter to Beccadelli of 16 September: "At the third scrutiny a document was read containing a summary of Morone's entire trial; by virtue of that document the trial was annulled and quashed—indeed, burned—and the cardinal was declared not only Catholic but wholly innocent of this cruel persecution that he has endured for so long."

127. Ibid., p. 374.

128. Ibid., p. 355.

129. Ibid., pp. 380-81.

130. Ibid., p. 379.

131. Ibid., p. 364, note 795, letter to Beccadelli of 9 September.

132. Ibid., pp. 382-83; see also the following pages

133. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione, cited above, pp. 17 ff.

134. R. De Maio, Alfonso Carafa, cited above, pp. 56-60, 312-15; E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, p. 156.

135. On the conclave, in addition to the accounts by Onofrio Panvinio and Antonio Guidi published in CT, vol. II, pp. 576 ff., see R. de Hinojosa, *Felipe II y el cónclave de 1559*, cited above; Theodor Müller, *Das Konklave Pius IV. 1559: historische Abhandlung*, F. A. Perthes, Gotha 1889; Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 12 ff.; Giovanni Drei, *La politica di Pio IV e del cardinale Ercole Gonzaga (1559-1560)*, in *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, XL (1917), pp. 65-115, especially pp. 69 ff.; R. Rezzaghi, *Cronaca di un conclave*, cited above, pp. 550 ff.; A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 24 ff.

136. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 43; see pp. 43-45.

137. R. Rezzaghi, Cronaca di un conclave, cited above, pp. 559, 566, 568, 574, 575.

138. PM, vol. III, p. 383.

139. FiAS, Urbino, I. G. 134, f. 509r.

140. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 443.

141. SAG, Estado, 886, n. 3, memoriale del 1o January 1560.

142. E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, p. 157.

143. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 72, 129.

144. See, for example, Ippolito Chizzola's letters to Cosimo de' Medici of 28 September 1560 and 14 February 1561, published by G. Caravale, *Predicazione e Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 259, 269.

145. See above, section I.2.

146. *Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento*, cited above, p. 253: "The duke of Florence, arch-tyrant, | my lord, | has promised little Medici | to make him pope by force or destiny, | or else by simony or deceit. | And Medici promises within a year | to enlarge his dominion elsewhere | without arms and without spending a farthing, | although it greatly harms the Church."

147. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 68-69, 100-13, 153-55.

148. See above, section IX.2; F. Rurale, L'ascesa dei fratelli Medici, cited above, pp. 292 ff.

149. Paolo Tiepolo would describe him in these terms in 1569 (Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 169).

150. "Put the thought of that cat-faced | Cardinal Medici out of your mind, | for he is far too devoted to the Empire" (*Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento*, cited above, p. 250).

151. See the *Relatione del cardinal d'Augusta del raggionamento havuto con quello di Medici* of 12 October 1559, followed by a *Seconda narrativa dell'illustrissimo cardinal d'Augusta*, copies of which are preserved in BAV, Urb. lat., 847, ff. 167v-174v, and ASV, Miscell. Arm. II, 41, ff. 138r-144v; see Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 32-33.

152. PM, vol. III, p. 387, note 866.

153. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 40.

154. PM, vol. III, pp. 391-92, 405-6.

155. See Francisco Vargas's letter to Philip II of 19 June 1561, in which he reported, among other things, that Pius IV had gone so far as to call the Milanese cardinal the son of a traitor and a traitor himself. This supported the hypothesis that, although the pope employed him and publicly showed him favor, he was in fact hostile to him: "They say that this enmity arises from the fact that they are both Milanese, divided by resentments and rivalries; from the fact that Morone worked to bring the Marquis of Marignano (whose wife is his relative) to Rome, toward whom—as is well known—the pope is very ill disposed; […] and finally from Morone's evident papal ambitions, which the Borromeos cannot tolerate." Vargas therefore believed that the cardinal would enter the next conclave with little chance of success (SAG, Estado, 890, n. 69).

156. CT, vol. II, pp. 531-32, diario di Ludovico Firmano; see also p. 341.

157. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 50-51.

158. S. Pagano, Il processo, cited above, p. 333.

159. Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento, cited above, p. 270; see p. 279.

160. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 51-54.

161. Pio Paschini, Il primo soggiorno di S. Carlo Borromeo a Roma 1560-1565, now in Id., Cinquecento romano e riforma cattolica, Lateranum, Roma 1958, pp. 93-181, in part. p. 97.

162. Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph, cited above, p. 231.

163. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 52; see p. 95; Pastor, vol. VII, p. 2.

164. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 74; see p. 130.

165. Ibid., p. 130.

166. Ibid., pp. 74-76.

167. See above, section XVII.2.

168. PM, vol. II, pp. 67 ff.

169. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 354-55.

170. Ibid., pp. 335-37.

171. See especially article 9, as well as articles 25 and 70 (ibid., pp. 150, 161, 189).

172. Ibid., pp. 110 ff., 115 sgg; see also pp. 349-50.

173. Ibid., vol. I, pp. 541 ff.

174. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 223 ff.

175. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 338-39; on him see vol. I, p. 1265, note 5.

176. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1599 ff.

177. E. Masini, Sacro arsenale, cited above, pp. 122-23.

178. Franciscus Peña, Instructio seu praxis inquisitorum, in appendice a C. Carena, Tractatus, cited above, p. 467.

179. PM, vol. II, pp. 143 ff., 192 ff., 751-52.

180. E. Masini, Sacro arsenale, cited above, p. 126.

181. PM, vol. II, pp. 754 ff.

182. Ibid., p. 131.

183. F. Peña, Instructio, cited above, pp. 467 ff.; see E. Masini, Sacro arsenale, cited above, pp. 122 ff.

184. See the text of his sentence of absolution of 27 May 1560 in PM, vol. III, p. XXVI, note 61.

185. F. Peña, Instructio, cited above, pp. 475-76.

186. On him see PM, vol. II, p. 18, note 7.

187. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 769 ff., 781 ff.

188. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1212-13.

189. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 388-89.

190. Ibid., pp. 387-88.

191. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 426 ff.

192. PM, vol. III, pp. 388, 391.

193. Ibid., pp. 395, note 888, 397.

194. Ibid., p. 392 (i corsivi sono in cifra nell'originale).

195. Ibid., pp. 392-95 and note 881; see also Francisco Vargas's letter to Philip II of 19 January 1560: "Because of his virtues, because he is Milanese, and because of the old friendship between their fathers, Morone is well regarded by the pope, and it is believed that he will play a decisive role in directing affairs of state; signs of this can already be seen, although he conducts himself with some reserve while awaiting a formal judgment ending the trial for which he was imprisoned" (ibid., p. 398).

196. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 747 ff., 767 ff.

197. Ibid., pp. 761 ff., the draft letter appointing the commissioners, dated 21 December, whereas the one intended for Bologna was sent the previous day (ibid., pp. 1220-21); see ibid., pp. 1577 ff., for the few surviving passages from the defensive proceedings held in Milan, Modena, Novara, and Venice.

198. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 390-91; on him see vol. I, p. 252, note 9.

199. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 145 ff., 749-50, 754 ff.

200. Ibid., pp. 1099 ff.

201. Ibid., pp. 107-9.

202. Ibid., pp. 1185 ff.

203. Ibid., pp. 1122 ff.

204. Ibid., pp. 1218-19.

205. In Tommaso Scotti's letter of 20 December 1559, which formally opened the Bolognese proceedings, the city's bishop and inquisitor were instructed "to examine the witnesses produced and enclosed here, as well as those named and to be named there by the agents of the said most reverend Cardinal Morone" (ibid., p. 1220; emphasis added).

206. Ibid., pp. 1566 ff.

207. Ibid., vol. III, p. 403.

208. Ibid., vol. II, p. 1567.

209. Ibid., pp. 1572-73, 1576.

210. See above, section XVII.4.

211. PM, vol. II, pp. 1581-83.

212. Ibid., vol. III, p. 332; on Bellencini, see ibid., vol. I, p. 911, note 228.

213. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 404-5.

214. Ibid., p. 403 and note 908.

215. Ibid., pp. 14 ff.

216. Ibid., vol. II, p. 966, note 5.

217. Ibid., vol. III, p. 397.

XVIII. "Morone Enjoys Great Esteem and Influence." The Pontificate of Pius IV

1. PM, vol. III, p. 404.

2. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 1601 ff.

3. Ibid., pp. 1738 ff.

4. CT, vol. II, p. 532; see p. 538.

5. PM, vol. II, p. 1576.

6. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 3-4.

7. Ibid., p. 410.

8. Ibid., pp. 405-6.

9. E. BONORA , Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, pp. 158 ff.; ID. , Roma 1564, cited above, pp. 139 ff.

10. PM, vol. III, pp. 408-9; on the epithet "Saint Patrick's well," see above, Introduction, p. 560.

11. Morone sought to deny these rumors, having Beccadelli reply on 24 January that "Your Lordship has been misinformed by those who spoke of his great authority at this court, for His Most Reverend Lordship avoids trouble and leaves government to those whose duty it is. It is true that His Holiness regards him favorably, and the cardinal, for his part, does not fail to obey him and offer reminders when occasion permits; he usually stays in Trastevere, a residence very far removed from ambition" (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, ff. 392r-393r).

12. Ibid., 1020/2, ff. 104r-107v; see also the subsequent letters to Beccadelli of 30 January; 2 and 12 February; 1, 7, and 26 March; 29 May; 11 and 13 June; 13 and 18 July; 2 and 30 August; 11 September; and 15 November 1561, in which he often asked for news of Morone and urged him to send an object that had belonged to Pole, especially a portrait of the Cardinal of England, whose very poor execution he later deplored: "That gentleman was gaunt, this one is full-faced; he was pale, this one is red and wears a Ferrarese mask; he had serene, moderately sized eyes, this one has great staring eyes that would frighten children. To say more clearly whom it resembles, it has far more of Cardinal Carafa than Cardinal Pole," he wrote on 17 January 1562 (ibid., ff. 140r-141v).

13. Ibid., ff. 138r-139v, letter of 12 December 1561; but see ff. 140r-141v, the letter of 17 January 1562.

14. Ibid., ff. 144r-145v.

15. Ibid., ff. 146r-148v, letter of 21 August 1562.

16. Ibid., ff. 155r-156v, 157r-158v.

17. Ibid., 1010, passim, and 1012/2, ff. 7v-8v, 9v-10v, 12rv, 16r.

18. Gigliola Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, Morone e gli "spirituali", in M. Firpo e O. Niccoli (edited by), Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase, cited above, pp. 53- 78, in part. pp. 55-57; see below, note 66.

19. He wrote in these terms to Galeazzo Florimonte il 4 January 1561 (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, ff. 389r-390r).

20. See ibid., ff. 402r-403r, his letters of May 1561.

21. See below, section XIX.3.
22. OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 131r-132v.
23. See below, section XIX.3.
24. PM, vol. III, pp. 408-9.
25. Ibid., p. 409 and note 932.
26. Ibid., pp. 5-9.
27. Ibid., pp. 10-13.
28. Ibid., pp. 14 ff.
29. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 243 ff., 747 ff.
30. Ibid. pp. 1577 ff.
31. Ibid., pp. 767 ff.
32. Ibid., p. 1211.
33. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 97 ff.
34. Ibid., p. 409, note 930 e 932.
35. Ibid., p. 410.
36. Ibid.
37. Ibid., p. 411.
38. Ibid., pp. 105 ff.
39. Ibid., pp. 95 ff.
40. Ibid., pp. 97 ff.
41. Ibid., pp. 413-14.
42. Ibid., p. 110.
43. Ibid., vol. II, p. 966, note 5.
44. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 575 ff.; see below, section XXI.5.
45. PM, vol. II, pp. 790 ff.
46. Ibid., vol. III, p. 103.
47. Ibid., p. 412.
48. Ibid., pp. 413-14.
49. Ibid., pp. 415-16, where Carnesecchi's contemporary letter to Gonzaga may also be consulted.
50. Ibid., p. 418; see pp. 390 ff.
51. Ibid., pp. 117-18.
52. According to information supplied by Pastor, vol. VII, p. 483 (referring to a document formerly preserved in NaAS, Pergamene dell'Archivio Farnese, 81, which was destroyed in the fire that ravaged the Farnese collection during the Second World War), on 18 March 1560 "the cardinal was absolved at Santa Maria in Trastevere from certain penalties imposed on him because of the suspicion that weighed upon him."
53. PM, vol. III, pp. 112-16.
54. As late as the mid-seventeenth century, the family archives preserved "a bundle containing several printed copies of the release granted by Pius IV in favor of Cardinal Morone. 1560, 13 March" (MnAS, Archivio Casati Stampa, register 311, f. [32]v).

55. See his long letter addressed to Pope Pius V in 1568, published by Lech Szczucki, W kręgu myślicieli heretyckich, Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolinskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk 1972, p. 204.

56. PM, vol. III, p. 436.

57. See Facchetto's letter to Stella of 23 March 1560 in BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 166/3; see Giuseppe Bonelli, *Un archivio privato del Cinquecento. Le carte Stella*, in *Archivio storico lombardo*, XVI (1907), pp. 3-57.

58. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 789, 807, 824, 830; CSP, Venice, vol. VII, pp. 269-70; CT, vol. VIII, p. 86. Morone's letter of credence to Philip II is dated 10 September (SAG, Estado, 886, n. 176), and Pius IV's is dated the 18th (ibid., n. 177). On 10 November the Spanish monarch wrote to the Milanese cardinal to thank him for his great devotion and readiness to serve, and to assure him of his favor (ibid., 891, n. 94).

59. See Morone's letter to the Duke of Sessa, then governor of Milan, of 20 April 1560 (PM, vol. III, p. 412, note 941).

60. Ippolito Orio reported this from Milan to Duke Ottavio Farnese on 26 November 1560 (PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 287).

61. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione, cited above, pp. 41-42.

62. PM, vol. III, pp. 120-21; Philip Attwood, Italian Medals, c. 1530-1600, in British Public Collections, The British Museum Press, London 2003, p. 156, nn. 179-80.

63. On 15 June Facchetto had written to Stella that Morone's departure for Milan "keeps being postponed until after Saint Peter's Day; […] Monsignor Gheri's journey to Spain is likewise being postponed," and on 24 August that the departure, though imminent, would be delayed once more (BgBC, Stella, 41, nn. 202, 212; VeAS, Senato. Dispacci degli ambasciatori. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 17, f. 88r, Giacomo Soranzo's letter of 31 August). On 1 October 1560 Beccadelli informed Giovanni Gondola of his transfer from Bologna to Rome, where he expected to arrive in early November (BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 311; PrBP, ms Palatino, 1010, ff. 377r-378r; see ff. 385v, 386r, 386v).

64. Writing from Bologna on 30 August, Beccadelli told Gualteruzzi that he was waiting for "the passage through Milan of the most illustrious Monsignor Morone, with whom I shall decide about my coming to Rome" (MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico; see also ibid., the letter of 14 September). On 22 September he said that he was now awaiting the cardinal, presumably already in Florence, who "will soon be with us and is most eagerly expected" (ibid.). On 7 September, as he prepared to leave for Milan, the cardinal wrote to arrange a meeting with him in Bologna on his return journey a month later. His stay in Milan lasted longer than expected, however, and on 29 October, as he prepared to depart, he asked his friend to meet him at Ravenna so that they could continue to Rome together (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1). On 2 November Beccadelli was waiting for news "so that I may mount my horse and meet him somewhere in Romagna," and on the 9th he said he already had "his boots on" (MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Beccadelli Ludovico). See Gualteruzzi's letter of 6 November, reporting that Alessandro Farnese had asked for news of him "and showed that he was pleased that Your Lordship is to come to Rome with Cardinal Morone" (OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 129r-130v).

65. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, pp. 848-49.

66. M. Firpo, La presa di potere, cited above, pp. 167 ff.

67. Ibid.

68. PM, vol. III, p. 426.

69. A. Aubert, Note su Giovan Francesco Verdura, cited above, p. 112.

70. PM, vol. III, p. XXVI , note 61.

71. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. 548 ff.; see also pp. LIV ff., LXXVII ff., LXXXIII ff.

72. Ibid., vol. II, pp. IX-X .

73. E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, p. 155; Id., Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V, in Maurilio Guasco e Angelo Torre (edited by), Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo, il Mulino, Bologna 2005, pp. 49-83, in part. pp. 49 ff.; Id. Morone e Pio IV, in M. Firpo e O. Niccoli (edited by), Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase, cited above, pp. 21-52; Id., Conflitti d'autorità tra vescovi, papato e Sant'Ufficio, in Patrick Arabeyre e Brigitte Basdevant-Gaudemet (edited by), Les clercs et les princes. Doctrines et pratiques de l'autorité ecclésiastique à l'époque moderne, École des chartes, Paris 2013, pp. 31-46.

74. E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, pp. 21-23.

75. PM, vol. II, p. 302.

76. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, p. 753.

77. See Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 97-98.

78. P. Sarpi, Istoria del concilio tridentino, cited above, vol. II, p. 755.

79. Gigliola Fragnito, La Bibbia al rogo. La censura ecclesiastica e i volgarizzamenti della Scrittura (1471-1605), il Mulino, Bologna 1997, pp. 95 ff.; Id., Pio V e la censura, in m. Guasco e a. Torre (edited by), Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo, cited above, pp. 129-58, especially pp. 130 ff.; see also V. Frajese, Nascita dell'Indice, cited above, pp. 66 ff.

80. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 157-59, and more generally pp. 150 ff., reconstructs Pius IV's "precise political strategy, aimed at shifting the balance of power from a discredited Congregation of the Inquisition to the College of Cardinals. The Holy Office was reduced to very few members, to the point that during 1560 the *Decreta* sometimes record the presence of only two cardinals. Moreover, during the first two years of his pontificate, Pius IV systematically avoided its meetings, at most temporarily appointing men loyal to him for specific cases" (p. 162); see also Id., *Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V*, cited above.

81. PM, vol. III, pp. 394, 397; the report also appears in Francisco Vargas's letter to Philip II of 19 January 1560 (SAG, Estado, 886, n. 19).

82. E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, p. 160.

83. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci degli ambasciatori. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 15, f. 71rv; see Pio Paschini, Un amico del card. Polo: Alvise Priuli, Pontificio seminario maggiore, Roma 1921, pp. 154 ff.

84. CT, vol. II, p. 347.

85. PM, vol. III, pp. 398-99.

86. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. XLIV-XLV .

87. Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 481 ff.

88. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 250. "Our cardinal," he continued, "says that he wishes to move to Milan and then return to Bologna. Monsignor Gheri, who was supposed to leave Spain on Saint John's Day, is expected from one day to the next." See also the subsequent letter of 19 July, in which Morone's familiar wrote that the cardinal had told him "that the pope loves him more than ever"; shortly before, because he "was not going to His Holiness as often as he used to, having no business," the pope had told him: "Please, most reverend Monsignor, do not abandon me" (ibid., n. 251).

89. Maria Franca Mellano, La Controriforma nella Diocesi di Mondoví (1560-1602), Stabilimento grafico Impronta, Torino 1955, pp. 60 ff.; Giuseppe Griseri, Il vescovo Michele Ghislieri e la città di Mondoví, in Una città e il suo vescovo. Mondoví al tempo del card. Michele Ghislieri, Atti del convegno (Mondoví, 9 October 2004), edited by Giancarlo Comino e Giuseppe Griseri, in "Bollettino della Società per gli studi storici, archeologici ed artistici della provincia di Cuneo", n. 133 (2005), pp. 7-113, see pp. 15- 23; Processi Carnesecchi, vol. I, pp. XIX , XCIX .

90. E. Bonora, Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V, cited above, pp. 55-56.

91. P. Scaramella, *L'Inquisizione romana e i valdesi*, cited above; see also his *Pio V e la repressione dell'eresia in Italia meridionale nella corrispondenza inquisitoriale dal Regno (1551-1565)*, in M. Guasco e a. Torre (edited by), Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo, cited above, pp. 85-110.

92. See above, section XII.2.

93. P. Paschini, Giovanni Grimani accusato di eresia, cited above, pp. 153, 159, 171; M. Firpo, Le ambiguità della porpora, cited above, pp. 132 ff.

94. E. Bonora, Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V, cited above, p. 54.

95. Ibid., pp. 49 ff.; Id., Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, pp. 162 ff.

96. E. Bonora, Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V, cited above, pp. 61 ff.; Id., Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, pp. 252 ff.

97. E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, p. 37; see also the following pages

98. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 547-50.

99. See above, section XV.4.

100. See below, section XXVII.2.

101. ACDF, Stanza storica, Decreta, vol. IV, ff. 67v-68r: "Johannis Harry angli: pro quo fuit lectum memoriale tenoris etc., quo audito praefati domini decreverunt quod, habita fide illustrissimi et reverendissimi cardinalis Moroni quod sit catholicus, concedetur [sic], alias non" [John Harry, Englishman: a memorial on his behalf was read, of the following tenor, etc.; after hearing it, the aforesaid lords decreed that it should be granted if the most illustrious and reverend Cardinal Morone gave assurance that he was a Catholic, otherwise not]. The document was noted by Christopher F. Black, *Storia dell'Inquisizione in Italia. Tribunali, eretici, censura* [2009], Carocci, Rome 2013, p. 63, who nevertheless completely reverses its meaning by stating that at the meeting "a memorial by an Englishman, John Harry, was read, maintaining that Cardinal Morone should be regarded as a good Catholic."

102. See above, section VIII.4.

103. For what follows as well see G. Caravale, Predicazione e Inquisizione, cited above, pp. 129 ff., 141 ff.

104. Ibid., p. 281.

105. Ibid., p. 264.

106. E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, pp. 27 ff.

107. Gustave Constant, Concession à l'Allemagne de la communion sous les deux espèces. Étude sur les débuts de la réforme catholique en Allemagne (1548-1621), 2 vols., E. de Boccard, Paris 1923, vol. I, p. 483; for what follows as well see pp. 461 ff.; E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, pp. 37-40.

108. E. Bonora, Roma 1564, cited above; see Id., Inquisizione e papato tra Pio IV e Pio V, cited above, pp. 72 ff.

109. Ibid., pp. 65 ff.

110. On 11-12 March 1564 Polanco wrote to Canisius expressing concern over Morone's possible appointment as legate in Germany "for the execution of the council's decrees, and under this pretext it is feared that he may have some commission concerning concession of the chalice, to which almost the entire College of Cardinals is, however, utterly opposed" (*Monumenta Borgia*, cited above, vol. VII, pp. 467-68; see also pp. 490, 503).

111. NB1, vol. IV, p. 57; see also the following pages, 36 ff., 76 ff., 94 ff., 333-34; J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 562-63, 569-70, 588 ff.

112. G. Constant, Concession à l'Allemagne, cited above, vol. II, p. 505.

113. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 558.

114. G. Constant, Concession à l'Allemagne, cited above, vol. II, pp. 954-55; see E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, pp. 28 ff., 47 ff.; Id., Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, pp. 256-61.

115. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 638.

116. See below, section XX.3.

117. See below, section XVIII.4.

118. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 171.

119. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 597.

120. E. Bonora, Morone e Pio IV, cited above, p. 49.

121. A. Aubert, Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione, cited above, pp. 50-52.

122. In addition to Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 99 ff., see R. Ancel, *La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa*, cited above, and especially A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 31 ff. More debatable are the arguments advanced by Miles Pattenden, *Pius IV and the Fall of the Carafa. Nepotism and Papal Authority in Counter-Reformation Rome*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2013, which treats the affair within the history of papal nepotism.

123. G. M. Monti, Studi sulla Riforma cattolica, cited above, pp. 113-17.

124. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci degli ambasciatori. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, f. 10v.

125. Pastor, vol. VII, p. 603.

126. G. Caravale, Predicazione e Inquisizione, cited above, p. 256; see pp. 262, 264, 272, and more generally pp. 135 ff.

127. On 5 March 1561 Facchetto wrote to Stella that Alfonso Carafa went about saying "that he wanted no other father than Cardinal Morone, and […] that he recognized that the favor he had received from the pope had come through Cardinal Morone's goodness; that he would always be a good and grateful son to him; and that, truly, had our cardinal not been there, things would have gone badly for him" (BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 235); see G. M. Monti, *Studi sulla Riforma cattolica*, cited above, p. 108.

128. R. De Maio, Alfonso Carafa, cited above, pp. 79 ff.

129. Pastor, vol. VII, p. 610.

130. SAG, Estado, 890, nn. 3, 9

131. Pastor, vol. VII, p. 119, note 4.

132. Ibid., pp. 611, 613.

133. See the report sent to Spain on 7 March (SAG, Estado, 889, n. 138); and the letter of 14 March (ibid., 890, n. 26).

134. CT, vol. II, p. 540; see p. 352; J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 354-55.

135. H. Seripandi, Diarium de vita sua, cited above, pp. 132, 139.

136. An informant of the Duke of Mantua described it in these terms on 8 March 1561 (Pastor, vol. VII, p. 612).

137. Bartholomaeus Platina, Historia de vitis pontificum romanorum a domino nostro Iesu Christo usque ad Paulum papam II, longe quam antea emendatior, cui Onuphrii Panvinii veronensis fratris eremitae augustiniani opera reliquorum quoque pontificum vitae usque ad Pium IV pontificem maximum adiunctae sunt, apud Michaelem Tramezinum, Venetiis 1562, pp. 309v ff.

138. Bartolomeo Platina, Le vite dei pontefici, presso Girolamo Savioni, Venezia 1730, parte II, pp. 552-53.

139. SAG, Estado, 892, n. 10.

140. On the affair, see E. Bonora, *Roma 1564*, cited above.

141. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 24-25.

142. Ibid., pp. 82, 113.

143. Lettere di principi, cited above, pp. 231r-232v; see Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 99-100.

144. Without entering into the vast bibliography, we refer only to M. Firpo and F. Biferali, *Immagini ed eresie*, cited above, pp. 231 ff.

145. Romeo De Maio, Riforme e miti nella Chiesa nel Cinquecento, Guida, Napoli 1992, p. 118.

146. G. Vasari, Le vite, cited above, vol. VI, pp. 202-3; see Francesco Repishti, Pio IV e il monumento di Giangiacomo Medici nel Duomo di Milano (1560-1565), in Carlo Borromeo, Pellegrino Tibaldi e la trasformazione interna del Duomo di Milano. Nuove acquisizioni critiche e documentarie, in "Nuovi annali", II (2010), pp. 153-61.

147. Aurelio Gotti, Vita di Michelangelo Buonarroti, 2 vols., Tipografia della Gazzetta d'Italia, Firenze 1876, vol. I, pp. 357-58; see Giorgio Vasari, Der literarische Nachlass, 2 vols., edited by Karl Frey e Herman-Walther Frey, Georg Müller, München 1923-30, vol. II, pp. 53-58.

148. Paul Joannides, The Drawings of Michelangelo and His Followers in the Ashmolean Museum, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007, pp. 241-44; David Scrase, Italian Drawings at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011, pp. 443-45; see Charles de Tolnay, Corpus dei disegni di Michelangelo, 4 vols., Istituto geografico De Agostini, Novara 1975-80, vol. III, pp. 60-61, nn. 400-1: Michael Hirst e Gudula Mayr, Michelangelo, Pontormo und das "Noli me tangere" für Vittoria Colonna, in Vittoria Colonna Dichterin und Muse, cited above, pp. 335-44, 346-47.

149. On more than one occasion in 1561, and sometimes successfully, the Milanese cardinal appealed to his Mantuan colleague to take into his service, or simply recommend, men close to him, such as Giovan Battista Castelli (10 March and 17 May; on him see PM, vol. II, p. 1567, note 5); former members of Pole's household such as Thomas Goldwell, a man "of great learning and exemplary life" (2 June; on him see ibid., vol. I, p. 822, note 33); Ludovico Beccadelli, his "very dear friend," and his nephew Girolamo Gallarati (30 August); or to thank him for what he had done for Egidio Foscarari, "regarding every kindness and favor shown to Monsignor of Modena as shown to myself" (11 October; MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1934; copies in MoAC, Capitolo, 109).

150. M. Firpo, Politica imperiale e vita religiosa, cited above

151. G. Ribier, Lettres et memoires d'Estat, cited above, p. 825; see R. de Hinojosa, Felipe II, cited above, p. 38, note 1.

152. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 361.

153. M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 335 ff.

154. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, El arzobispo Carranza y su tiempo, 2 vols., Ediciones Guadarrama, Madrid 1968, vol. I, pp. 134 ff., 267 ff.; Id., La reacción española ante el luteranismo (1520-1559), now in Id., Tiempos recios. Inquisición y heterodoxías, Sígueme, Salamanca 1977, pp. 23-32; Henry Kamen, The Spanish Inquisition. A Historical Revision, Yale University Press, New Haven - London 1997, pp. 83 ff.

155. PM, vol. III, p. 377; see also the Dominican master general's letter to Morone of 30 October 1559, recommending Carranza and asking him to intervene on his behalf with Cardinals Alessandrino, Puteo, and Cicala: "I know no other patron to acknowledge but Your Lordship" (ASV, Arm., LXIV, 30, f. 84r).

156. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, Don Carlos de Seso y el arzobispo Carranza. Un veronés introductor del protestantismo en España (1559), in Id., Tiempos recios, cited above, pp. 53-110; Id., Don Carlos de Seso. Bienes y biblioteca confiscados por la Inquisición (1559), in "Revista española de teología", XLIII (1983), pp. 193-97; Id., Don Carlos de Seso, luterano en Castilla. Sentencia inédita de su proceso

inquisitorial, in Homenaje a Pedro Sáinz Rodríguez, 2 vols., Fundación universitaria española, Madrid 1986, vol. I, pp. 295-307; Id., Fray Bartolomé Carranza y el cardenal Pole, cited above

157. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 449 ff., and Id., *Theologie, Geschichte und Politik im letzten Prozess der Inquisition gegen Pietro Carnesecchi (1566-67)*, in *Inquisition, Index, Zensur. Wissenskulturen der Neuzeit in Widerstreit*, Ferdinand Schöning, Paderborn 2001, pp. 121-40; the Italian text is in Id., *Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede*, cited above, pp. 22-46.

158. PM, vol. III, p. 252.

159. Ibid., p. 342.

160. See the Catholic king's letter to the Milanese cardinal of 30 November 1562 (SAG, Estado, 893, n. 11) and, by way of example, the letter sent from Toledo by Nuncio Prospero Santacroce to Carlo Borromeo on 28 August 1560, published by H. Laemmer, *Meletematum romanorum mantissa*, cited above, p. 181.

161. He wrote to him in these terms from Rome on 21 May 1561 (SAG, Estado, 889, n. 166; see also ibid., n. 184, letter of 6 October).

162. CSP, Venice, vol. VII, p. 133. In this connection it may also be useful to mention a curious *Epistola ut fertur Philippi regis Hispaniarum missa reverendissimis dominis cardinalibus sanctae romanae Ecclesiae in comitiis futuri pontificis congregatis et in conclavi inclusis*, published in 1559 without further printing information. It also referred to Morone's case, excluding him from election because he had long been imprisoned and accused of infamy. The pamphlet's author replied to such objections as follows: "Why should the faults cast in Morone's teeth harm him? If he was guilty, why was he not punished as he deserved? If the judgment was uncertain, why was he acquitted? And if he was perhaps released because the law did not permit him to be held any longer, while the slander barring him from the papacy nevertheless remained, why was he not acquitted on condition that he be deprived of passive voting rights? All this shows that he is not unworthy of the pontificate." The letter also contained a highly significant reference to the need to punish the inquisitors who in the past "had conducted themselves with criminal impiety."

163. PM, vol. III, p. 379.

164. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 290 (5 November 1560).

165. PM, vol. III, p. 386.

166. Ibid., p. 415.

167. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 40. In April 1569 Niccolò Franco would say that "in the time of Pius IV" Morone "was lord of the world" (A. Mercati, *I costituti di Niccolò Franco*, cited above, p. 121).

168. SAG, Estado, 889, nn. 85, 86.

169. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 35 ff.

170. OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 127r-128v.

171. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 215.

172. See Philip II's letter to Francisco Vargas of 13 March 1561 (SAG, Estado, 889, n. 38), and the reports sent by the latter on 22 December (ibid., 890, n. 3).

173. Henryk Damien Wojtyska, *Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent*, Institute of Ecclesiastical Studies, Rome 1967, pp. 17 ff. On the two most authoritative legates at the council, see the documents published by Giovanni Drei, *Il cardinale Ercole Gonzaga alla presidenza del concilio di Trento*, in *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, XL (1917), pp. 205-45; XLI (1918), pp. 171-222; Id., *La corrispondenza del cardinale Ercole Gonzaga presidente del concilio di Trento (1562-1563)*, in *Archivio storico per le province parmensi*, n.s., XVII (1917), pp. 185-242; XVIII (1918), pp. 29-143; Paul V. Murphy's weak monograph, *Ruling Peacefully. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga and Patrician Reform*

in Sixteenth-Century Italy, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 2007, pp. 196 ff.; and H. Jedin, *Girolamo Seripando*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 85 ff. See also Michele Cassese, *Girolamo Seripando, il concilio di Trento e la riforma della Chiesa*, in *Geronimo Seripando e la Chiesa del suo tempo nel V centenario della nascita*, proceedings of the conference (Salerno, 14-16 October 1994), edited by Antonio Cestaro, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1997, pp. 189-226; on Simonetta, see Eugène Sol, *Il cardinale Ludovico Simonetta datario di Pio IV e legato al concilio di Trento*, in *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, XXVI (1903), pp. 185-247.

174. SAG, Estado, 886, n. 80; see J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 340-41.

175. "I write this on the assumption that Cardinal Morone is innocent of the charges against him and that he is being maliciously accused. But should I be mistaken, and should you learn that the accusations have a foundation and that he is in fact implicated in these religious matters, not only would I refrain from helping him, but I would make the pope understand that my greatest desire and my most earnest request is that heretics be severely punished, so that they cannot harm our faith" (PM, vol. III, p. 335). On 22 August Caracciolo replied: "Your Majesty may rest easy concerning those lines written there in your own hand, for the said most reverend Morone is regarded as thoroughly Catholic; it was the malicious intentions of certain rivals that kept him imprisoned there" (SAG, Estado, 884, n. 188).

176. See Filippo Gheri's letter to the then archbishop of Salerno of 4 May 1560 (NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 64, f. 180r; published by M. Cassese, *Girolamo Seripando e i vescovi meridionali*, cited above, vol. II, p. 23).

177. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, pp. 346-47.

178. SAG, Estado, 1475, n. 94.

179. Il documento è pubblicato in M. Firpo, Inquisizione romana, cited above, pp. 366-69.

180. On him see PM, vol. I, p. 554, note 15.

181. FiAS, Urbino, I. G. 105, f. 1041r.

182. See below, section XIX.1.

183. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. I, p. 317.

184. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 351.

185. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, p. 360 (14 March 1561).

186. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 9 ff. As early as the end of September 1560 Pius IV had considered sending Morone to the next German diet, "intending to charge those legates with treating the question of clerical marriage, which, although the emperor urges that it be settled, the pontiff keeps postponing" (VeAS, Senato. Dispacci degli ambasciatori. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 17, ff. 103v-104r, Giacomo Soranzo's letter of 26 September 1560).

187. J. J. J. von Döllinger, *Beiträge*, cited above, vol. I, p. 487; see pp. 413-15, Vargas's letter of 11 April 1562, and pp. 478 ff., the instruction of 28 December 1562 for Don Luis de Requesens, sent as ambassador to Rome.

188. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 102.

189. Ibid., p. 107; see Legazioni di Averardo Serristori, cited above, p. 390; see also p. 393; Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 513 ff.

190. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 503, letter of 7 April 1563; see also p. 511.

191. Ibid., pp. 505-6, 523.

192. Ibid., pp. 556-57; see also p. 559, letter of 12 March 1563. Spain opposed the plan to send Morone as legate to Germany to deal with these questions after the council closed (see ibid., pp. 556 ff.; see also Philip II's letter to the emperor of 23 April 1564 in *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, vol. CI, Rafael Marco y Viñas, Madrid 1891, pp. 71-73).

193. See below, section XXI.1.

194. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 142; see p. 141: “He is highly esteemed for what he accomplished at the council and is very experienced in affairs of state. […] Yet the fact that he was imprisoned by the Inquisition, although acquitted, will always arouse strong opposition to him. Moreover, it was he who promised Emperor Ferdinand use of the chalice, though in the pope’s name; nevertheless, since this greatly displeased all the cardinals, he remains in their disfavor. He is also thought to be so duplicitous by nature that he is nicknamed Saint Patrick’s well, in which, they say, no bottom can be found; hence he is not much loved by the cardinals.” On the nickname given to Morone, see above, section XVIII.1.

XIX. “It Is Not Proper for His Holiness to Impale Himself.” The Reconvening of the Council of Trent

1. R. Ancel, *Paul IV et le concile*, cited above; see Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 26 ff., who defines the Carafa pontificate as “a cruel disappointment.”

2. E. BONORA , Morone e Pio IV, cited above, pp. 21-22.

3. Ibid., p. 25.

4. PASTOR , vol. VII, pp. 133 ff.; JEDIN , vol. IV, pp. 35 ff.

5. G. CARAVALE , Predicazione e Inquisizione, cited above, p. 256.

6. Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti, cited above, vol. IV, p. 25.

7. Ibid., p. 119.

8. PASTOR , vol. VII, p. 99; JEDIN , vol. IV, pp. 39-40; see A. P. ROBINSON , The Career, cited above, pp. 115 ff.

9. P. SARPI , Istoria del concilio tridentino, cited above, vol. I, p. 6.

10. SAG, Estado, 889, n. 27.

11. Alain Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente (1518-1563)*, École française, Rome 1997, pp. 283 ff.; see Paolo Sadoleto’s letter to Morone from Montargis of 15 September 1561, where he had accompanied Cardinal Ippolito d’Este to visit his sister-in-law, Renée of France (ASV, Conc. trid., 42, ff. 143r-144v).

12. Facchetto wrote in these terms to Stella on 31 May 1561 (BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 247).

13. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, Filippo II e il concilio di Trento, in Il concilio di Trento come crocevia della politica europea, Atti della settimana di studio (12-17 September 1977), edited by Hubert Jedin e Paolo Prodi, il Mulino, Bologna 1979, pp. 109-35.

14. “Ad ipsum concilium inchoandum seu continuandum” [to begin or continue the council itself], Angelo Massarelli wrote in his diary, then attempting with some embarrassment to explain the evident contradiction (CT, vol. II, p. 349). On the final phase of Trent, in addition to Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 133 ff.; J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above; and G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, it is enough to refer to Jedin, pp. 35 ff.; Id., *La conclusione del concilio*, cited above; and the syntheses by John W. O’Malley, *Trento. Il racconto del concilio*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 2013, pp. 149 ff., and Adriano Prosperi, *Il concilio di Trento. Una introduzione storica*, Einaudi, Turin 2001, pp. 73 ff.

15. SAG, Estado, 891, n. 20.

16. Ibid., 890, n. 15; J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 350; see above, section XVIII.4.

17. See above, sections XII.1 e XVI.1.

18. For what follows as well see Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 95 ff.

19. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 217.

20. Ibid., n. 219.

21. Ibid., n. 218; see n. 220.

22. Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 125 ff.

23. Ibid., pp. 153 ff.

24. See above, section XVIII.3.

25. Egidio Foscarari e Giovanni Morone, Carteggio durante l'ultima fase del concilio di Trento (1561-1563). Edizione critica, edited by Matteo Al Kalak, Aschendorff, Münster 2018, pp. 14, 80; see Jedin, vol. IV/1, p. 161.

26. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 15.

27. [Pier Paolo Vergerio], De reverendo domino Stanislao Hosio Varmiensi episcopo, apostolico nuncio per Germaniam destinato, s. l. [ma Regiomonti 1560], p. 7v.

28. Pier Paolo Vergerio, A' reverendissimi vescovi congregati in Trento. Della enormità del concilio loro, s. i. t. [1560], p. B4v.

29. G. Caravale, Predicazione e Inquisizione, cited above, pp. 98-99; for what follows as well see ibid., pp. 167 ff.

30. Ippolito Chizzuola, *Risposta alle bestemmie et maldicenze contenute in tre scritti di Paolo Vergerio*, appresso Andrea Arrivabene, Venice 1560, pp. 6, 9-10. Vergerio replied with a pamphlet entitled *Ai fratelli d'Italia: di un libro di fra Ippolito Chizzola da Brescia*, published in Tübingen in 1563 and reissued two years later in the expanded *Risposta del Vergerio in quattro libri divisa ad una invettiva di fra Ippolito Chizzuola da Brescia scritta contra la propria dottrina di Giesú Christo, contra le chiese riformate di Germania, contra i lor principi e ministri*, which appeared in 1565.

31. P. Simoncelli, Il caso Reginald Pole, cited above, pp. 202 ff.; T. F. Mayer, Reginald Pole, cited above, pp. 356 ff.

32. E. Bonora, Giudicare i vescovi, cited above, p. 188.

33. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 55 (già 57), f. 77r.

34. Ibid., f. 79v; see Carlo De Frede, *La restaurazione cattolica in Inghilterra sotto Maria Tudor nel carteggio di Girolamo Seripando*, Libreria scientifica editrice, Naples 1971, pp. 119-20; on Rullo, see De Frede's *Un pugliese familiare del cardinal Pole: Donato Rullo*, now in Id., *Religiosità e cultura*, cited above, pp. 117-63.

35. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 55 (già 57), f. 82r; see C. De Frede, La restaurazione cattolica, cited above, pp. 122-24.

36. See above, section XVIII.1.

37. Processi Carnesecchi, vol. II, pp. 836-37 (i corsivi sono in cifra nell'originale).

38. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. I, pp. 42-44, 65.

39. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 62, ff. 111bisr ff.

40. H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando, cited above, vol. II, pp. 632-33.

41. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 133r (originale); NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 62, f. 115bisr.

42. E. Foscarari and G. Morone, *Carteggio*, cited above, p. 45; see pp. 12-13; on Foscarari's role in the affair, see M. Al Kalak, *Il riformatore dimenticato*, cited above, pp. 199 ff.

43. NaBN, ms XIII. AA. 62, f. 116r.

44. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. I, p. 76.

45. The son of Morone's sister Amabilia and Catalano Gallarati, who had caused the cardinal so much trouble in Bologna at the end of the 1540s (see above, section IX.4), Girolamo was appointed by Pius IV

on 27 May 1560, shortly after his uncle's absolution, to succeed Michele Ghislieri in the diocese of Sutri and Nepi. He settled there after the council and sought to promote Tridentine reforms and establish a seminary, as he would later do at Alessandria after being transferred to that diocese in 1564; he died in 1568. On him, see Giuseppe Antonio Chenna, *Del vescovato, de' vescovi e delle chiese della città e diocesi d'Alessandria*, 3 vols., Tipografia d'Ignazio Vimercati, Alessandria 1785-86, vol. I, pp. 282-85; Daniele De Marchis, *Girolamo Gallarati, vescovo di Sutri e i suoi interventi al concilio di Trento*, in *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia*, LI (1997), pp. 97-142. In subsequent years the diocese of Sutri and Nepi would again be entrusted to Morone's relatives: Donato Stampa in 1569 and Orazio Morone in 1580, a few months before the cardinal's death.

46. G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 57-58; on the printing of Pole's *De concilio*, see T. F. Mayer, *A Reluctant Author*, cited above, pp. 26-27; A. P. Robinson, The Career, cited above, pp. 118-20.
47. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 183rv.
48. Ibid., ff. 151r-152v.
49. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.
50. H. Jedin, *Girolamo Seripando*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 99 ff.; in addition to Anna Maria Giorgetti Vichi, *Annali della Stamperia del popolo romano (1570-1598)*, Istituto di studi romani, Rome 1959, see Francesco Barberi, *Paolo Manuzio e la Stamperia del popolo romano (1561-1570)*, facsimile reprint, Gela stampa, Rome 1985; Paolo Sachet, *Publishing for the Popes. The Cultural Policy of the Catholic Church towards Printing in Sixteenth-Century Rome*, PhD dissertation, The Warburg Institute, London 2015, pp. 173 ff., reprinted in Id., *A Humanist Printer Moves from Venice to Rome. The Curial Patronage of Paolo Manuzio*, in *La stampa romana nella città dei papi e in Europa*, proceedings of the seminar (Rome, 11 November 2011), edited by Cristina Dondi, Andreina Rita, Adalbert Roth, and Marina Venier, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 2016, pp. 217-33. Nearly sixty Manuzio editions appeared in Rome from 1561 onward. A note by Morone on the "printing house of the Roman people and its warehouse," dated 5 December 1578, is in ASV, Misc. Arm., XI, 93, f. 104r.
51. Aspetti della riforma cattolica e del concilio di Trento, cited above, p. 136; see Giovan Battista Intra, Di Ippolito Capilupi e del suo tempo, in "Archivio storico lombardo", XX (1893), pp. 76-142, in part. pp. 114-15.
52. Paolo Manuzio, Epistolarum libri XII, apud Aldum, Venetiis 1580, pp. 463-66.
53. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. I, p. 81; see pp. 82-85, 155.
54. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 51; CT, vol. VIII, p. 250.
55. H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando, cited above, vol. II, p. 633.
56. Ibid., pp. 636-37.
57. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 49; see pp. 11-12; CT, vol. VIII, pp. 247-48.
58. BoBU, ms 1621, ff. 40r-41r; see M. Al Kalak, Il riformatore dimenticato, cited above, pp. 200-1.
59. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 50; see p. 54.
60. Foscarari wrote in these terms to Morone il 29 September (ibid., p. 53).
61. See his letter of 27 November (ibid., p. 59); see H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando, cited above, vol. II, pp. 103-4.
62. Lodovica Braida, Libri di lettere. Le raccolte epistolari del Cinquecento tra inquietudini religiose e "buon volgare", Laterza, Roma-Bari 2009, pp. 54 ff.
63. Ibid., pp. 227-28.
64. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. I, p. 155.

65. G. Fragnito, Gasparo Contarini, cited above, p. 338.

66. The text is also in P. Manuzio, Epistolarum libri XII, cited above, pp. 99-111, in part. p. 107 (corsivi aggiunti).

67. See his letter of 20 June 1562 to Ippolito Capilupi, then nuncio in Venice, cited by G. B. Intra, *Di Ippolito Capilupi e del suo tempo*, cited above, p. 115.

68. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1939, f. 462r; see J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 45.

69. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 205r; on the 12th Foscarari thanked Morone for the copy sent to him (E. Foscarari and G. Morone, *Carteggio*, cited above, p. 77; see G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, p. 340).

70. See Morone's letter to Gonzaga of 19 February: "I performed the service that Your Most Illustrious Lordship commanded me to undertake with the most illustrious Borromeo, so that the quantity of books by the late most reverend Pole that Your Lordship desires may be sent; I hope it will be done soon, and I shall press the matter, although I believe that will not be necessary" (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1939, f. 480r; copy in MoAC, Capitolo, 109).

71. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 84 (2 March 1562).

72. Ibid., p. 78; see M. Al Kalak, Il riformatore dimenticato, cited above, p. 201.

73. Edita in Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. I/2, pp. 269-353.

74. Andreas Dudith, *Vita Reginaldi Poli britanni sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinalis et cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, in Pole, *Epistolae*, vol. I, pp. 1-65. The Hungarian prelate's scant correspondence with Morone during his stay at Trent is in Andreas Dudith, *Epistulae*, editae curantibus Lecho Szczucki et Tiburtio Szepessy, 6 vols., Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1992-2002, especially vol. I, index.

75. Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, p. 294.

76. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1, letter of 22 November 1562.

77. Ibid.; see Gualteruzzi's letter to Beccadelli of 3 August 1563, when he was reading Beccadelli's *Life of Pole* with great pleasure (OBL, ms Ital., C. 24, ff. 129r-130v); on Beccadelli's role in printing Pole's works, see G. Fragnito, *Gasparo Contarini*, cited above, pp. 334 ff.

78. id., Memoria individuale, cited above, pp. 16 ff.

79. PM, vol. III, p. 498.

80. G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, p. 56.

81. A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 112 ff.; see also p. 134, where he reiterates that after Pius IV's election the spirituali "were again prominent in a papal administration," while adding that by this date it is perhaps better to speak of "moderates," such as Seripando, Morone himself, "and those connected to him," who are not further identified. Yet the sources—as will now be seen—indicate the deep rupture that then opened between the Milanese cardinal and figures such as Beccadelli and Foscarari; Robinson himself describes it as "a crisis for the spirituali in much the same manner as the crisis in 1541 over Contarini's view on justification" (ibid., p. 135).

82. See above, section XVII.2.

83. See below, section XXI.1.

84. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 63; see also p. 70.

85. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 35, 41; on the bitter conciliar debates over this issue, see Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 187 ff.; see also Id., *La lotta intorno all'obbligo di residenza dei vescovi 1562-63*, in Id., *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, cited above, pp. 295-315; Id., *La conclusione del concilio*, cited above, pp. 35 ff.

86. Ricardo G. Villoslada, Pedro Guerrero representante de la reforma española, in Il concilio di Trento e la riforma tridentina, cited above, vol. I, pp. 115-56; Antonio Marín Ocete, El arzobispo don Pedro Guerrero y la política conciliar española en el siglo XVI, C.S.I.C., Madrid 1970; Juan López Martín, La imagen del obispo en el pensamiento teológico- pastoral de don Pedro Guerrero en Trento, Iglesia nacional española, Roma 1971.

87. P. Sarpi, Istoria del concilio tridentino, cited above, vol. II, p. 797.

88. See below, section XX.4.

89. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 37-39, 49, 150 ff. For what follows, see G. Fragnito, *La terza fase del concilio di Trento*, cited above, pp. 59 ff.; Lucia Felici, *Al crocevia della riforma. Egidio Foscarari nella terza fase del Tridentino*, in M. Firpo and O. Niccoli (eds.), *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase*, cited above, pp. 79-116, especially pp. 102 ff.; S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Una gentildonna irrequieta*, cited above, pp. 251 ff.

90. PrBP ms Palatino, 1020/2, ff. 146r-148v; see G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 58-59.

91. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 85.

92. Ibid., p. 125.

93. CT, vol. XIII/1, pp. 607-12.

94. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 99-100; for what follows as well see pp. 18 ff.; M. Al Kalak, Il riformatore dimenticato, cited above, pp. 203-5 and note 92.

95. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 215rv; see also ibid., ff. 261r-262v, the subsequent letter of 6 April; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 70; Jedin, Il concilio, vol. IV/1, pp. 193-94.

96. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 261r; on the positions adopted by Girolamo Gallarati, see D. De Marchis, *Girolamo Gallarati*, cited above, pp. 111 ff.

97. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 102.

98. Muzio Calini, Lettere conciliari (1561-1563), edited by Alberto Marani, Fratelli Geroldi, Brescia 1963, pp. 148-49; see p. 46; CT, vol. VIII, p. 437.

99. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 206.

100. On Nacchianti, see G. Italiano, *La pastorale eterodossa*, cited above; on Stella, see PM, vol. I, p. 1081; vol. II, p. 1584.

101. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 103.

102. Ibid., p. 105, letter of 16 April 1562; see also pp. 107 ff.

103. Ibid., p. 107; see p. 18.

104. G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 60-61.

105. Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, pp. 322-24.

106. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

107. See above, section XVIII.1.

108. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, pp. 132-33; see also the following pages

109. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 119; see J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 130.

110. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 115.

111. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 129 (letter of 14 May 1562).

112. Jedin, vol. IV/1, p. 192.

113. The Milanese cardinal's autograph letter is in ASV, Conc. trid., 42, f. 287r; it was published, with a few errors, by Stephan Ehses, *Briefwechsel zwischen dem Kardinal Johann Morone und dem Bischof Thomas Stella von Capo d'Istria (1562)*, in *Briefmappe*, cited above, pp. 136-45; see E. Foscarari and G. Morone, *Carteggio*, cited above, p. 19; M. Al Kalak, *Il riformatore dimenticato*, cited above, pp. 206-9.

114. S. Ehses, Briefwechsel, cited above, p. 139.

115. G. Drei, La corrispondenza del cardinale Ercole Gonzaga, cited above, p. 78.

116. E. Foscarari and G. Morone, *Carteggio*, cited above, pp. 121-30; see pp. 19-20. The letter is also published in *Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 327-40, with many variants, some substantial; see L. Felici, *Al crocevia della riforma*, cited above, pp. 104 ff.; M. Al Kalak, *Il riformatore dimenticato*, cited above, pp. 209-12. On 5 May, at Foscarari's request, Borromeo would again remind Morone of the bishop's wish to "remain at his church, since that church has great need of the continual presence of its bishop because of the unhealthy humors that have sometimes prevailed among the people of that region" (J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. III, p. 229).

117. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 132.

118. Ibid., pp. 133-34.

119. Ibid., pp. 135-36; see p. 148, Foscarari's reply of 18 June, grateful that Morone had not "lent an ear to so false a slander"; and p. 20.

120. Ibid., pp. 21-22; see M. Al Kalak, Il riformatore dimenticato, cited above, pp. 212-16.

121. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 145.

122. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 207.

123. Ibid., p. 181.

124. Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, pp. 345-47.

125. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

126. See Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 216-17.

127. On him see above, sections XII.2 e XX.6.

128. Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, pp. 347-50; for what follows as well see G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 61 ff.

129. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

130. His reply of 29 June is in Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, pp. 350- 52.

131. Ibid., pp. 352-55, 358-60, letters of 16 and 27 July and 3 and 10 August 1562; see also the following pages.

132. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1, letters of 4 and 24 July; 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29 August; 5, 12, 19, and 29 September; 10, 18, and 31 October; 7, 21, and 28 November; and 12 December 1562.

133. G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 74-77, in part. p. 75, note 68.

134. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

135. A. Prosperi, L'eresia del Libro Grande, cited above, p. 353.

136. ASV, Conc. Trid., 42, ff. 319r-320v; see J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 206.

137. ASV, Conc. Trid., 42, ff. 328r-329v.

138. In a cursory reconstruction of Morone's clash with Beccadelli, Foscarari, and Gallarati, A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 135, attributes it to a "misunderstanding" (pp. 125 ff.), since in his view Morone undoubtedly agreed that residence was desirable but did not consider it necessary to ground it in divine law, provided the desired result was achieved—especially if the debate risked obstructing the council and harming the papacy (p. 148).

139. ASV, Conc. trid., 42, see G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, pp. 65 ff.

140. Monumenti di varia letteratura, cited above, vol. II, pp. 340-45.

141. H. Jedin, La conclusione del concilio, cited above, pp. 81 ff.

142. John C. Olin, Catholic Reform. From Cardinal Ximenes to the Council of Trent (1495- 1563), Fordham University Press, New York 1990, p. 31.

143. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. II, p. 140, letter to Ercole Gonzaga of 11 May 1562.

144. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 188-89.

145. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 140.

146. E. Foscarari and G. Morone, *Carteggio*, cited above, p. 132, letter of 21 May 1562; see pp. 18-19; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 161.

147. Jedin, vol. IV/1, p. 213.

148. Ibid., p. 225.

149. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, pp. 184 ff.

150. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 446; see E. Brambilla, Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio, cited above, pp. 469 ff.

151. Pastor, Storia, vol. VII, pp. 315-16, 623-25.

152. H. D. Wojtyska, Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent, cited above, p. 293.

153. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1.

154. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 99; see also pp. 108-21.

155. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 267.

156. Ibid., n. 268.

157. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, pp. 126, 155.

158. Ibid., p. 251.

159. Ibid., p. 257.

160. Ibid., p. 259.

161. Jedin, vol. IV/1, p. 236.

162. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 133.

163. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 226 ff.

164. Ibid., pp. 245 ff.; and by Jedin himself, La conclusione del concilio, cited above, pp. 49 ff.

165. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 269-71.

166. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 217, 255.

167. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, pp. 16-17.

168. H. Jedin, Girolamo Seripando, cited above, vol. II, p. 643.

169. See Miguel Roca Cabanellas, Diego Laynez en la ultima etapa del concilio, in Il concilio di Trento e la riforma tridentina, cited above, vol. I, pp. 85-114.

170. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. II, p. 347.

171. Ibid., p. 363; see G. Constant, Concession à l'Allemagne de la communion, cited above, pp. 212 ff.

172. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 273 ff.

173. M. Scaduto, *L'epoca di Giacomo Laínez*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 263-64. On 1 April 1563 Polanco wrote to Borja that "the matter has been well handled with Morone" (*Monumenta Borgia*, cited above, vol. VII, p. 182).

174. A. Guerra, *Note a margine*, cited above, pp. 95-96 (also for the quotation).

175. S. Pavone, Preti riformati e riforma della Chiesa, cited above, pp. 117-18.

176. *Monumenta Borgia*, cited above, vol. VII, p. 256, letter from Trent of 15 June 1563.

177. S. Ehses, Briefwechsel, cited above, p. 141.

178. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 327 ff.

179. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 16.

180. On him, in addition to the overview by A. Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente*, cited above, pp. 777 ff., we refer to Henry Outram Evennet, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent. A Study in the Counter-Reformation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1930, and to the collection of essays edited by Jean Balsamo, Thomas Niklas, and Bruno Restif, *Un prélat français de la Renaissance. Le cardinal de Lorraine, entre Reims et l'Europe*, Droz, Geneva 2015.

181. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 39-40, letter of 29 October 1562.

182. A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, pp. 361-63; see also the following pages

183. Briefe von Andreas Masius, cited above, p. 348; see Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 346 ff.

184. A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, pp. 356 ff.; in part. p. 357 and note 86.

185. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 356 ff.; A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, pp. 372 ff., 778 ff.

186. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 117; see A. P. Robinson, The Career, cited above, pp. 130-31.

187. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 346, 348.

188. G. Fragnito, La terza fase del concilio di Trento, cited above, p. 77.

189. S. Ehses, Briefwechsel, cited above, pp. 143-45.

190. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 274, Facchetto's letter to Stella of 8 January 1563.

191. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, pp. 139-40.

192. See above, section XII.2.

193. M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, p. 375, letter of 14 January 1563.

194. Jedin, vol. IV/1, pp. 376 ff., and by Jedin himself, La conclusione del concilio, cited above, pp. 65 ff.

195. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 498.

196. Ibid., p. 208.

197. Ibid., pp. 388 ff.; see the draft papal reply in G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 16-29.

198. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, pp. 253-54; see p. 258.

199. SAG, Estado, 894, n. 16, Vargas's letter to Philip II of 7 March.

200. E. Foscarari e G. Morone, Carteggio, cited above, p. 250; G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 2.

201. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, pp. 267-68, 271, 508; M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 419.

202. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 6; on Morone's legation, see also H. Lutz, Kardinal Morone, cited above

203. J. J. J. von Döllinger, Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 478.

204. Ibid., p. 513; see H. h. Schwedt, Die Anfänge der Römischen Inquisition, cited above, p. 181.

205. S. Ricci, Il sommo inquisitore, cited above, pp. 115-16.

206. SAG, Estado, 893, nn. 7 e 9.

207. Juan de Verzosa, *Epístolas*, edited by Eduardo del Pino González, Instituto de Estudios Humanísticos-CSEC, Alcañiz-Madrid 2006, vol. I, pp. 609-11; see also pp. 622-24, for a poem of his addressed to Filippo Gheri. The poem in Morone's honor, datable to 1570 and preserved in ASV, Conc. trid., 13, f. 125r, may perhaps also be attributed to him.

208. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 282.

209. CT, vol. II, p. 679.

210. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. XXIX , note 1, pp. 13-15.

211. Ibid., pp. XXIV-XXXV ; Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 16.

212. J. W. O'Malley, *Trento. Il racconto del concilio*, cited above, p. 155; see Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 50, and more generally pp. 43 ff.; Id., *La conclusione del concilio*, cited above, pp. 81 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 148 ff.

XX. "He Has Delivered the Church of God from Such Tribulation in Such Perilous Times." President of the Council

1. UMBERTO MAZZONE , Giovanni Morone legato al concilio di Trento e la clausola "proponentibus legatis", in M. FIRPO e O. NICCOLI (edited by), Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase, cited above, pp. 117-41, in part. p. 118.

2. On 7 April 1563 Francisco Vargas wrote to Philip II that the pope had appointed Morone because he was convinced that the cardinal played a decisive role with the emperor, "as one who is very devoted to him and openly professes it" (J. J. J. von Döllinger, *Beiträge*, cited above, vol. I, p. 506).

3. M. CALINI , Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 423.

4. CT, vol. IX, p. 472.

5. Ibid., vol. II, p. 545; see J. J . J. VON DÖLLINGER , Beiträge, cited above, vol. I, p. 50; M. CALINI , Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 445.

6. G. CONSTANT , La Légation, cited above, p. XXXVII .

7. Ibid., pp. 31-33.

8. Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle, cited above, vol. I, pp. 535-36, 538.

9. Ibid., pp. 9-10; CT, vol. II, pp. 566-67, 677, 836; vol. IX, p. 471; J. ŠUSTA , Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 291; see pp. 285, 287; M. CALINI , Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 427-28; see JEDIN , vol. IV/2, pp. 20-21.

10. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 294.

11. Ibid., pp. 292-95; entro poco piú di un mese Roma riforní i legati di 11 000 scudi (ibid., vol. IV, p. 15).

12. CT, vol. IX, pp. 472-73; see A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 138-39. His speech was immediately printed in Padua under the title *Verba prolata ab illustrissimo domino Ioanne cardinale Morono, primo praesidente et legato concilii Tridentini in eius prima comparitione in generali congregatione die Martis 13 aprilis 1563* (a copy is in SAG, Estado, 893, n. 1).

13. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 429, 436.

14. *Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle*, cited above, vol. I, p. 541; see p. 547. The cardinal hoped for Morone's prompt return to Trent so that they could once again "set to work in earnest on the business of that holy council" (ibid., p. 541; see also p. 544).

15. Ibid., vol. III, pp. 295, 308; CT, vol. IX, p. 474; see M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 429-30.

16. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 47.

17. NB2, vol. III, p. 287; on them see PM, vol. I, p. 481, note 34; vol. II, p. 1223, note 10; and see above, index.

18. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. XXV and notes 4-6, 33-37. The report of the meeting, dated 23 April, shows that the subjects discussed were the possible postponement or suspension of the council, its subordination to the pope, the *proponentibus legatis* clause, reform *in capite*, the conclave, the appointment of cardinals, bishops, and archbishops, and the possibility that the pope himself might come to Trent or Bologna (ibid., pp. 37-44); see Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 20-22; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 143 ff.

19. A letter from Innsbruck stated this il 3 May (BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 285; see n. 284).

20. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 47.

21. Ibid., pp. 33 ff., 65, 74, 77, 80; see pp. XXIV ff.; NB2, vol. III, pp. 282, 295, 301-2; SAG, Estado, 893, n. 142, Vargas's letter of 15 June 1563.

22. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 69.

23. Ibid., pp. XLVII ff.; see the detailed *Summario della risposta data dal cardinal Morone all'imperatore*, drafted by Morone himself, in NB2, pp. 270-76, 295-302; Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 25 ff.

24. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 78-79; NB2, vol. III, p. 297.

25. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 328, letter of 10 May 1563.

26. U. Mazzone, Giovanni Morone, cited above, pp. 124 ff.

27. NB2, vol. III, pp. 295-302; G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 121, 133-35.

28. SAG, Estado, 889, n. 27, letter of 20 March 1561.

29. See above, section XVIII.2.

30. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 451-52; see pp. XLIX ff.

31. P. Canisii, Epistulae et acta, cited above, vol. IV, p. 121; see Monumenta Borgia, cited above, vol. VII, p. 186.

32. P. Canisii, *Epistulae et acta*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 139, Polanco's letter of 12 April 1563.

33. Monumenta Borgia, cited above, vol. VII, pp. 147-49.

34. Ibid., p. 179.

35. Ibid., p. 192, letter of 12 May 1563; Polanco's reply of 16 May is in ibid., pp. 207-8: "We have rejoiced in the Lord at the very close goodwill shown by the most illustrious legate."

36. Ibid., p. 235, Polanco's letter to Canisius of 3 June 1563.

37. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 68, f. 7r; see Facchetto's letters to Stella of 11 and 15 May 1563 (BgBC, Stella, 41, nn. 287, 288).

38. H. D. Wojtyska, Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent, cited above, p. 367; see J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. III, p. 334; G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 128; M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 451.

39. BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 289, Facchetto's letter to Stella of 31 May 1563.

40. NB2, vol. III, pp. 303-12, in part. p. 304.

41. Ibid., pp. 304, 306-7.

42. Ibid., pp. 310-11.

43. Ibid., p. 313; see J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 18; G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 137-38.

44. NB2, vol. III, p. 319.

45. See the aforementioned Facchetto letter to Stella of 31 May 1563 (BgBC, Stella, 41, n. 289).

46. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 442-43 (see pp. 439-40), pp. 445, 451.

47. He described him in these terms in a letter of 30 May 1563 (H. D. Wojtyska, *Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent*, cited above, p. 368).

48. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 139 ff.

49. Giuseppe Alberigo, Le potestà episcopali nei dibattiti tridentini, in Il concilio di Trento e la riforma tridentina, cited above, vol. II, pp. 471-523.

50. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 54.

51. Ibid., p. 86; see p. 91.

52. Ibid., pp. 100-1.

53. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 455.

54. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 76.

55. A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, p. 787; see pp. 381 ff., 785 ff.; Jedin, vol. IV/1, p. 374; see pp. 367 ff.

56. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 41.

57. Ibid., p. 152; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 31.

58. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 64.

59. The legates wrote in these terms il 14 June (ibid., p. 67).

60. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 168, note 2.

61. Ibid., pp. 430-31.

62. Ibid., p. 50, letter from the legates of 10 June; see also the following pages.

63. Ibid., p. 69; see M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 477.

64. J. W. O'Malley, Trento. Il racconto del concilio, cited above, pp. 191-92.

65. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 475-76; see G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 181-83.

66. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 75 ff.; and by Jedin himself, La conclusione del concilio, cited above, pp. 81 ff.

67. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 496.

68. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 210-14, Ferdinand I's letter to Morone of 31 July 1563.

69. Ibid., pp. 195-97; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 132-33.

70. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 205.

71. Ibid., pp. 217-18.

72. Ibid., p. 496; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 525.

73. H. D. Wojtyska, Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent, cited above, pp. 85 ff.

74. A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, p. 399; see Id., Giovanni Morone, il cardinale di Lorena e la conclusione del concilio, in M. Firpo e O. Niccoli (edited by), Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase, cited above, pp. 143-58.

75. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 198-99; see pp. 215-16; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 173-74.

76. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 204, 217, letter to Borromeo of 26 July and coded reply of 4 August; see J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 140, 174-75. Morone himself would shortly afterward change his mind (G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 261-62).

77. Borromeo wrote to him in these terms on 28 July (id., La Légation, cited above, p. 205; see pp. 218-19, 226, 229-31; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 155-56).

78. M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, p. 478 (letter of 23 June 1563).

79. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 127.

80. A. Tallon, La France et le concile de Trente, cited above, pp. 794 ff.

81. Ibid., pp. 777 ff.; on the Cardinal of Lorraine, his role at Trent, and his political shift in the spring of 1563, see also pp. 394 ff.

82. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 200, letter to Borromeo of 19 July; see the legates' dispatch of 22 July, also drafted by Morone, published by J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 135 ff.

83. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 200-2.

84. Ibid., p. 209; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 148-49; see also pp. 143-44, 152-54.

85. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 231; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 193.

86. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 130; but see more generally pp. 127 ff.; and by Jedin himself, *La conclusione del concilio*, pp. 112 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 163 ff.

87. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 184.

88. CT, vol. IX, p. 819.

89. See the summary of the Cardinal of Lorraine's negotiations with the pope published by G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 563-65; Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 136-38; and especially A. Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente*, cited above, pp. 785 ff.

90. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 239-40; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 214.

91. G. Tallon, Giovanni Morone, il cardinale di Lorena, cited above, p. 156.

92. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 34.

93. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 139 ff.

94. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 190.

95. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, pp. 512-13.

96. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 176; see P. Prodi, Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti, cited above, vol. I, pp. 167 ff.

97. J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, p. 224.

98. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 247-48; see p. 260.

99. Ibid., pp. 248-49.

100. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 297; see the letter he addressed to the Milanese cardinal that same day (G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, p. 233).

101. Ibid., p. 280.

102. M. Calini, Lettere conciliari, cited above, p. 537.

103. Ibid., p. 527.

104. G. Constant, La Légation, cited above, pp. 304-17; J. Šusta, Die römische Kurie, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 307-16.

105. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 367.

106. See below, section XX.3.

107. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 175 ff.

108. CT, vol. IX, pp. 795 ff.

109. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 252; see ibid., p. 254, for the legates' reply.

110. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 209, and more generally pp. 201 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 165 ff., who identifies a serious "Morone crisis" in September 1563 (p. 168).

111. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 567-68.

112. Ibid., pp. 222 ff.

113. A. Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente*, cited above, pp. 387 ff., 400 ff.

114. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 268-69; see also pp. 271-75, 277-78, 283, 303-4. The text of du Ferrier's oration is in CT, vol. IX, pp. 841-44; see A. Tallon, *Giovanni Morone, il cardinale di Lorena*, cited above, pp. 155-56, according to whom that speech marked "the rupture between French diplomacy and the council."

115. On this matter, see the substantial memorandum Morone sent to Pius IV on 7 October, edited by G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 291-99, and more generally U. Mazzone's essay Giovanni Morone, cited above, pp. 132 ff.

116. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 194-96.

117. See the instruction of 19 September, drafted by Morone for Bishop Carlo Visconti, who was leaving for Rome before being sent as nuncio to Philip II (J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 256-62).

118. Ibid., p. 369.

119. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 573; see CT, vol. IX, pp. 965 ff.

120. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 379; see E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 194; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 171.

121. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 343.

122. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 375.

123. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 444; see J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 459-60; see also the following pages.

124. A. Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente*, cited above, pp. 394 ff.; see Stuart Carroll, The *Compromise of Charles Cardinal of Lorraine*, in «Journal of Ecclesiastical History», LIV (2003), pp. 469-83.

125. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 384, 400; J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 390.

126. CT, vol. IX, pp. 1014 ff.

127. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 419.

128. M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, pp. 567-71.

129. Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 235 ff.; see J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 397.

130. CT, vol. II, p. 718.

131. Hubert Jedin, *Genesi e portata del decreto tridentino sulla venerazione delle immagini*, in Id., *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, cited above, pp. 340-91.

132. See the report sent to Borromeo on 30 November (G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 414-19).

133. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 432.

134. See the conversation with the Milanese cardinal reported by Stanisław Hosjusz in a letter sent on 7 December 1563 to Marcin Kromer, the Polish ambassador in Vienna (H. D. Wojtyska, *Cardinal Hosius Legate to the Council of Trent*, cited above, p. 282).

135. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 420.

136. Edited by Viktor Schultze and Wilhelm Maurenbrecher, *Morones's Bericht über das Tridentiner Konzil*, in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, III (1879), pp. 653-58, and later by G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 436-39, especially p. 438. For what follows, see also Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 253 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 179 ff.

137. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 423.

138. See CT, vol. IX, pp. 1076 ff.

139. Ibid., vol. II, p. 719; vol. IX, pp. 1109-10.

140. Ibid., vol. II, p. 876.

141. Ibid., p. 719.

142. Ignasi Fernández Terricabras, *Felipe II y el clero secular. La aplicación del concilio de* Trento, Sociedad estatal para la conmemoración de los centenarios de Felipe II y Carlos V, Madrid 2000, p. 86.

143. On 6 December Facchetto had written to Stella that they would leave for Mantua that very day (BgBC, Stella, 41, no. 306).

144. CT, vol. II, pp. 546, 878. Facchetto wrote to Stella on 25 December: "Yesterday at the nineteenth hour, the most illustrious monsignor, together with the most illustrious Simonetta, made his entry into Rome, where they were met a mile outside the Ponte Molle by the most illustrious Borromeo and Altemps, accompanied by many prelates and lords - the Marquis of Marignano was there as well - and thus on horseback […] they went straight through the Prati to the Palace and, still wearing their riding boots, to the pope's bedside, where they were received with many expressions of affection; after kissing his foot, he had our lord cardinal sit beside the bed, while Cardinal Simonetta went to his place. […] He then summoned Monsignor Gheri and showed him many marks of affection, after which they all went to their rooms. Our most illustrious monsignor dined with the most illustrious Borromeo, and they exchanged many courtesies; many favorable words are said to have been spoken about our most illustrious lord" (BgBC, Stella, 41, no. 307).

145. Ibid., no. 308.

146. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 436-39.

147. Jedin, vol. IV/2, p. 263.

148. M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, p. 578.

149. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 389-90; J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 401.

150. On him, see Giampiero Brunelli's entry *Gallio, Tolomeo*, in DBI, vol. LI, pp. 685-90.

151. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. 395; see also pp. 432-33, for the letter Cardinal Giovan Francesco Gambara sent him on 11 December 1563.

152. P. Paschini, *Il primo soggiorno di S. Carlo Borromeo a Roma*, cited above, p. 110.

153. CT, vol. IX, pp. 1142-43.

154. I. Pogiani, *Epistolae et orationes*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 383-84.

155. See below, section XXI.5.

156. Alain Tallon, *Le concile de Trente et l'Inquisition romaine. À propos des procès en matière de foi au concile*, in «Mélanges de l'École française de Rome», CVI (1994), pp. 129-59.

157. L. Amabile, Il Santo Officio, cited above, vol. I, pp. 265 ff.; Gino Cappelletti, Gianfrancesco *Alois e l'agitazione napoletana dell'anno 1564 contro la santa Inquisizione. Studio con documenti inediti*, Arduini, Urbino 1913; Ernesto Pontieri, *L'agitazione napoletana del 1564 contro il tribunale dell'Inquisizione e la missione del teatino Paolo Burali d'Arezzo presso Filippo II*, now in Id., *Nei tempi grigi della storia d'Italia. Saggi storici sul periodo del predominio straniero in Italia*, Edizioni scientifiche italiane, Naples 1966, pp. 197-246.

158. G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 295, 234, 241; J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 169, 199, 214; see also pp. 175, 195, 198, 209, 219, 222, 227-29, 255; M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, p. 517; see Jedin, vol. IV/2, pp. 120-21; M. C. Giannini, *Fra autonomia politica e ortodossia religiosa*, cited above.

159. See above, section XVIII.1. For what follows, see also A. Tallon, *Le concile de Trente et l'Inquisition romaine*, cited above, pp. 140 ff.; Antonio Battistella, *L'assoluzione del patriarca d'Aquileia Giovanni Grimani*, in Memorie storiche forogiuliesi, IX (1913), pp. 379-82; P. Paschini, *Giovanni Grimani accusato di eresia*, cited above, pp. 178 ff.; E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 81 ff.; A. Del Col, *Le vicende inquisitoriali di Giovanni Grimani*, cited above, pp. 89-91.

160. See the draft of his letter to Vargas of 9 June 1563 (SAG, Estado, 894, no. 102).

161. Ibid., 895, no. 18.

162. M. Calini, *Lettere conciliari*, cited above, pp. 507, 513; see p. 498.

163. CT, vol. II, p. 570.

164. See above, section XVIII.2. It was against the background of this affair that in 1563 the Venetian patrician Giovan Maria Memmo published in Venice the *Dialogo, nel quale dopo alcune filosofiche dispute si forma un perfetto prencipe, una perfetta repubblica e parimenti un senatore, un cittadino, un soldato et un mercatante*. Its interlocutors include Giovanni Grimani and Bernardo Navagero, then presiding over the council with Morone, who was urged to promote the reform of the Church together with him; see Federica Ambrosini, *Profilo ideologico di un patrizio veneziano del '500*, in Studi veneziani, n.s., VIII (1984), pp. 77-107; A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, p. 115; Gino Benzoni, *Memmo, Giovan Maria*, in DBI, vol. LXXIII, pp. 420-24; E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 70 ff.

165. BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 75r.

166. E. Bonora, *Roma 1564*, cited above, p. 108 and note 16.

167. See above, section XVIII.1.

168. ASV, Conc. trid., 27, ff. 515r, 522rv.

169. "I imagine that Cardinal Alessandrino will shield himself by saying that, since this was a matter belonging to the Office of the Inquisition, it was not proper for it to remain outside the Office; but God grant that this is true, rather than that he did it in order to malign others, as he has done," he wrote, among other things (ibid., 32, ff. 227r-230v; see f. 364rv, the draft, which bears witness to the care with which Morone wished to preserve these papers).

170. At f. 423rv (the draft is at f. 356rv); edited by G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, pp. 346-47. "Messer Pier Luigi will write to you about the outcome of that removed trial, etc., and I know that it will set your mind at rest," Gallio informed Morone on that same 23 October (ASV, Conc. trid., 27, f. 536r).

171. ASV, Conc. trid., 27, f. 544rv; partially edited by G. Constant, *La Légation*, cited above, p. XIX, note 2.

172. See above, section XVIII.1.

173. E. Bonora, *Morone e Pio IV*, cited above, pp. 42-44.

174. See below, section XXII.1.

175. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 207-8, note 39. This copy was probably taken for the occasion from a valuable chest in which, as the Venetian ambassador would write on 16 July 1566, "when the pontiff entered the conclave in which he was elected, he placed all the papers concerning the Inquisition that he had collected over a long period, […] arranging them with great care. Then, after his election, his house was sacked, and the chest was taken along with the other possessions. He was therefore deeply distressed, believing that he had lost a very great treasure, whereas the person who had acquired it considered it of no importance. But after a diligent search was made, he finally found the chest, to his great joy, in the house of a neighbor and had it brought back. All the documents by virtue of which so many people have been detained in this matter - brought here from various places, with still others expected - were taken from this chest" (VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 345r-346v).

176. J. J. J. von Döllinger, *Beiträge*, cited above, pp. 573-75.

177. M. Firpo and F. Biferali, Navicula Petri, cited above, p. 332. Girolamo Catena, *Vita del gloriosissimo papa Pio quinto dall'istesso autore riveduta et ampliata*, per Alessandro Gardano et Francesco Coattino, Rome 1587, pp. 60-61, reports that Pope Ghislieri regarded the Cardinal of Carpi as a "partner in the defense of Catholic truth."

178. Facchetto wrote this to Stella on 29 April 1564 (BgBC, Stella, 41, no. 327).

179. See above, section XVIII.1.

180. J. de Verzosa, *Epístolas*, cited above, p. 996.

181. On this matter we need only refer here to Massimo Firpo's essay, "Boni christiani merito vocantur haeretici." Bernardino Ochino e la tolleranza, in Henry Méchoulan and Richard H. Popkin (eds.), *La formazione storica della alterità. Studi di storia della tolleranza nell'età moderna offerti a Antonio Rotondò*, 3 vols., Olschki, Florence 2001, now in Id., Disputar di cose pertinente alla fede, cited above, pp. 247-320.

182. After Delio Cantimori's classic work *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento e altri* scritti, edited by Adriano Prosperi, Einaudi, Turin 1992, pp. 152 ff., the fundamental studies are those of Antonio Rotondò collected in *Studi e ricerche di storia ereticale italiana del Cinquecento*, Giappichelli, Turin 1974, and in the critical editions of C. Renato, Opere, cited above, and Lelio Sozzini, Opere, Olschki, Florence 1986.

183. Bernardino Ochino, Dialogi XXX, 2 vols., per Petrum Pernam, Basileae 1563, vol. II, p. 421.

184. Ibid., pp. 379-84; see p. 386.

185. Ibid., p. 421.

186. See above, section II.2.

187. See above, section XX.2.

188. H. Laemmer, *Meletematum romanorum mantissa*, cited above, p. 214; the bull is edited in CT, vol. IX, pp. 1152 ff.; see Jedin, vol. IV, pp. 327 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 181 ff.

189. BgBC, Stella, 41, no. 309.

190. P. Sarpi, *Istoria del concilio tridentino*, cited above, vol. II, p. 1259.

191. Ignasi Fernández Terricabras, *Il concilio di Trento e il potere del re. Il questionario di Filippo II ai vescovi spagnoli e le loro risposte (1564)*, in A. Prosperi, P. Schiera, and G. Zarri (eds.), *Chiesa cattolica e mondo moderno*, cited above, pp. 107-22.

192. I. Pogiani, *Epistolae et orationes*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 381-92.

193. Giuseppe Castiglione, *Silvii Antoniani sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinalis vita* […]; *eiusdem Silvii orationes 13 ad illustrissimum et reverendissimum dominum, dominum cardinalem Aldobrandinum*

sanctae romanae Ecclesiae camerarium, apud Iacobum Mascardum, Romae 1610, pp. 113-19, especially pp. 116-17.

194. A. Prosperi, *Il concilio di Trento*, cited above, pp. 88 ff.

195. Pastor, vol. VII, p. 527, note 4.

196. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 49; see Angelo Walz, I *domenicani al concilio di Trento*, Herder, Rome 1961.

197. Pio Paschini, *Il catechismo romano del concilio di Trento. Sue origini e sua prima diffusione*, in Id., *Cinquecento romano*, cited above, pp. 33-91.

198. See, for example, the case of the Barnabites studied by E. Bonora, *I conflitti della* Controriforma, cited above.

199. M. Firpo, Vittore Soranzo, cited above, pp. 502 ff.; and B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above, pp. 164-68, according to whom "reform, as envisioned by the authors of the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia* of 1537, seems largely to have failed where money and property were involved."

200. Gigliola Fragnito, *Storia di Clelia Farnese. Amori, potere, violenza nella Roma della* Controriforma, il Mulino, Bologna 2013, pp. 105, 153-54.

201. See, for example, the collections of essays: P. Prodi (ed.), *Disciplina dell'anima, disciplina del corpo*, cited above; Id. and Wolfgang Reinhard (eds.), *Il concilio di Trento e il moderno*, il Mulino, Bologna 1996; Cesare Mozzarelli and Danilo Zardin (eds.), *I tempi del concilio. Religione, cultura e società nell'Europa tridentina*, Bulzoni, Rome 1997, especially Agostino Borromeo's essay *I vescovi italiani e l'applicazione del concilio di Trento*, ibid., pp. 27-105; Paolo Prodi, *Il paradigma tridentino. Un'epoca della storia della Chiesa*, Morcelliana, Brescia 2010, pp. 19 ff.; and also Simon Ditchfield, *Tridentine Catholicism*, in Alexandra Bamji, Geert H. Janssen, and Mary Laven (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation*, Ashgate, Farnham 2013, pp. 15-31 (on this volume, see E. Bonora, *Il ritorno della Controriforma*, cited above); Wolfgang Reinhard, *Mythologie des Konzils von Trient*, in M. Catto and A. Prosperi (eds.), *Trent and Beyond*, cited above, pp. 27-43; E. Belligni, *Voci di riforma*, cited above, pp. 263 ff.

202. Hubert Jedin, *Riforma cattolica o Controriforma?* [1946], Morcelliana, Brescia 1967, pp. 81 ff.

203. See the fundamental study by Michele Mancino and Giovanni Romeo, *Clero criminale. L'onore della Chiesa e i delitti degli ecclesiastici nell'Italia della Controriforma*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2013; for a specific case, Marco Cavarzere, *La giustizia del vescovo. I tribunali ecclesiastici della Liguria orientale (secc. XVI-XVIII)*, Pisa University Press, Pisa 2012; for the upper levels of the Curia, B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above; M. Rosa, *La curia romana nell'età moderna*, cited above, pp. 40 ff., on the "paths of a failed reform."

204. J. W. O'Malley, *Trento e dintorni*, cited above, p. 77.

205. *Pasquino. Cinquecento pasquinate*, cited above, p. 258.

206. M. Firpo e F. Biferali, *«Navicula Petri»*, cited above, pp. 288-89.

207. P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 389 ff., 419, where a judgment by Jedin is repeated. The substantial preparatory materials for the Acta are edited in CT, vol. III, pp. 231 ff.

208. See above, Introduction; E. Belligni, *Voci di riforma*, cited above, pp. 205 ff.

209. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, cited above, pp. 136-37.

210. Ibid., p. 133.

211. Ibid., p. 53.

212. Ibid., p. 91.

213. Ibid., p. 53; see p. 92.

214. Ibid., pp. 134-35.

215. Pastor, vol. VII, pp. 631-32.

216. P. Paschini, *Il primo soggiorno di S. Carlo Borromeo a Roma*, cited above, pp. 137 ff. For the vast bibliography on Saint Charles, in addition to Michel de Certeau's entry Carlo Borromeo, in DBI, vol. XX, pp. 260-69, we need only refer to the collections of essays *San Carlo e il suo tempo*, 2 vols., proceedings of the conference (Milan, 21-26 May 1984), Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1986; John M. Headley and John B. Tomaro (eds.), San Carlo Borromeo. Catholic Reform and Ecclesiastical Politics in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century, Folger Books, Washington 1988; Nicola Raponi and Angelo Turchini (eds.), *Stampa, libri e letture a Milano nell'età di Carlo Borromeo*, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 1992; P. C. Pissavino and G. Signorotto (eds.), *Lombardia borromaica Lombardia spagnola*, cited above, especially vol. II; F. Buzzi and D. Zardin (eds.), Carlo Borromeo e l'opera della "Grande Riforma," cited above; and Wietse de Boer's study *La conquista dell'anima. Fede, disciplina e ordine pubblico nella Milano della Controriforma* [2001], Einaudi, Turin 2004.

217. E. Bonora, *Morone e Pio IV*, cited above, pp. 51-52.

218. BgBC, Stella, 41, no. 251.

219. Few significant elements emerge from Maurizio Sangalli's essay Due principi *della Chiesa: Giovanni Morone e Carlo Borromeo*, in M. Firpo and O. Niccoli (eds.), *Il cardinale Giovanni Morone e l'ultima fase*, cited above, pp. 187-224.

220. I. Pogiani, *Epistolae et orationes*, cited above, vol. III, p. 363.

221. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, p. 91.

222. Ibid., pp. 133-35.

223. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, p. 922.

224. *Vita del Pellegrino penitente. Autobiografia di Bonsignore Cacciaguerra 1495-1566*, edited by Raffaella Ragone, with an introduction by Romeo De Maio, Vivarium, Naples 2006.

225. See above, section XVIII.3.

226. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 138.

227. J. Šusta, *Die römische Kurie*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 454; see Pastor, vol. VII, p. 323, note 2.

228. See the illustrations in F. Buzzi and D. Zardin (eds.), Carlo Borromeo e l'opera della "Grande Riforma," cited above.

229. Angelo Turchini, *La fabbrica di un santo. Il processo di canonizzazione di Carlo Borromeo e la Controriforma*, Marietti, Casale Monferrato 1984.

230. M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, pp. 192-93; see PM, vol. II, pp. 1544 ff.

231. M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, passim.

232. PrAS, *Carteggio* farnesiano estero, 444, 446, letters to Alessandro Farnese of 8 July 1561, 3 April and 29 May 1562, the last thanking him for the welcome given to Filippo Gheri, who left Rome on 27 April and returned on 11 September (BgBC, Stella, 41, nos. 255, 267).

233. M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, pp. 192, 196-98.

234. Ibid., pp. 199-201.

235. Andrea Bonavita, *Sepolture in San Giovanni in Conca: Carlo Borromeo, Vincenzo Seregno e il rinnovamento della chiesa dei carmelitani*, in Arte lombarda, no. 157 (2009), pp. 17-30, especially p. 22.

236. M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, p. 204; on the Modenese synod, see below, section XXII.3. Morone believed that Borromeo had shown excessive rigor at the first Milanese provincial synod, doing "many things that the Council of Trent did not have the courage to do, and perhaps with

too much rigor, so that I have grave doubts that they will be observed" (S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, p. 184).

237. M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, pp. 204, 221.

238. Ibid., pp. 211-12, 214.

XXI. Pius V, "A Most Fierce Persecutor of Heretics"

1. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *La città rituale. Roma e le sue cerimonie in età moderna*, Viella, Rome 2002, p. 87. For what follows, see also M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 471 ff.; Id., introduction to M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo*, cited above, pp. 9-25; Id., *Le contraddizioni di un inquisitore. Pio V e il processo del cardinale Giovanni Morone*, in *San Pio V nella storia*, proceedings of the conference (Pavia, 24 May 2012), edited by Carlo Bernasconi, Collegio Ghislieri, Pavia 2012, pp. 45-57; PM, vol. III, pp. XI ff.

2. M. Firpo and F. Biferali, Navicula Petri, cited above, pp. 309 ff.

3. PASTOR, vol. VIII, pp. 585-86.

4. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, f. 90r.

5. Benno Hilliger, *Die Wahl Pius' V zum Papste*, Gustav Fock, Leipzig 1891; Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 2 ff.; Nicole Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, Fayard, Paris 1994, pp. 83 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 193 ff.

6. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 141.

7. J. J. J. Döllinger, *Beiträge*, cited above, vol. I, p. 571.

8. Ibid., pp. 573-75.

9. Ibid., p. 586.

10. Ibid., p. 579; see p. 586. At the end of November 1563, shortly after arriving in Rome, Requesens had written to Philip II that he did not know Morone, although he was aware of his prestige; yet Morone did not seem to him to enjoy much support in the Sacred College. The same was true of Ghislieri, who had none because he was regarded as excessively severe, although in Requesens's view precisely such severity was what was needed (SAG, Estado, 895, no. 221). A month later, when the king asked to be informed about possible candidates for the tiara in the event of a vacancy, Requesens replied that Morone was unlikely to be elected because, although he had many friends, he also had enemies, including all the cardinals created by Paul IV. His being Milanese, like the pope, and the accusations of those who reproached him for his imprisonment and inquisitorial trial despite his absolution also counted against him (ibid., no. 257). For what follows, see also M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 345 ff.

11. SAG, Estado, 897, no. 152.

12. *Correspondencia diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el pontificado de san Pio V*, edited by Luciano Serrano, 4 vols., Junta para la ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas, Escuela española en Roma, Madrid 1914, vol. I, p. 52.

13. SAG, Estado, 900, no. 15.

14. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, f. 110rv, Paolo Tiepolo's letter of 27 December.

15. Ibid., f. 108rv.

16. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 65; see also pp. 66-67; B. Hilliger, *Die Wahl Pius' V*, cited above, p. 129.

17. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 57; see also p. 101, Requesens's reply of 23 January 1566, in which he described Morone as a far wiser and morally more irreproachable man than

Alessandro Farnese, while adding that “everyone thinks he has many things in his breast that he would reveal if he became pope,” and that he himself would try to prevent Morone’s election by giving him only the faintest support, as the king had ordered, and then saying that nothing more could be done.

18. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 207.

19. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, p. 938 (“and you, mistress Pasquina, | who see and remain silent, and let Morone | fill the Church with confusion”), and the many other pasquinades cited above, chapter XVII, note 119, which indirectly testify to the way the inquisitorial campaign against Morone and the spirituali had fixed a heterodox image of him that was by then widely diffused.

20. C. Cantù, *Gli eretici d’Italia*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 202-3; see above, section XVII.3.

21. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 162r.

22. See the letter of 15 December 1565 in which the Mantuan resident nevertheless hoped that such a “storm” could be averted, “since, as Your Excellency knows, Morone is good neither for us nor for the world” (Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 592); and the vivid account by Cornelio Firmano, published ibid., pp. 589 ff.: “There were many who wanted and vigorously urged that Morone be elected pope, while others wanted him excluded. Negotiations were conducted and alliances formed amid such haste, shouting, noise, and crowding that it was scarcely believable. Some cardinals hurried almost at a run, carrying burning candles, without the help of any conclavist; others went without lights and half dressed, evidence of how bitter the struggle had become. But if Morone had been led into the chapel that night, he would undoubtedly have become pope, for his opponents were terrified, their faces white as linen cloth, and at first they did not know what to do. Yet because they had some time at their disposal - whether because such was the will of God, whose secrets we cannot know, or because his hour had not yet come - before the scrutiny they succeeded in securing his absolute exclusion”; see B. Hilliger, *Die Wahl Pius’ V*, cited above, pp. 121 ff.

23. SAG, Estado, 894, no. 167, *Çedula de cosas del cónclavi primera*.

24. Pierpaolo Merlin, *I cardinali sabaudi nell’età di Emanuele Filiberto (1559-1580)*, in Gianvittorio Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds.), La corte di Roma tra Cinque e Seicento. “Teatro” della politica europea, Bulzoni, Rome 1998, pp. 299-321, especially p. 319.

25. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, f. 114rv, Paolo Tiepolo’s letter of 29 December.

26. SAG, Estado, 894, nos. 168, 169, 173.

27. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, f. 108rv.

28. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 163r; see Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 17-19, and the cautious account offered a few years later by G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 22: “Asked whether he wished to support Morone’s election, he said that he first wished to celebrate Mass and would then give his answer, as indeed he did; the answer was that in conscience he could not support him, citing the reason for which Morone had been imprisoned in the time of Paul IV.”

29. See above, section XX.4.

30. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 19. The religious and political conflict of the conclave was naturally destined to disappear beneath the hagiographical cautions of Counter-Reformation historiography. This can be seen, for example, in the edifying account of Morone’s exclusion offered by Ioannes Antonius Gabutius, *De vita et rebus gestis Pii V pontificis maximi*, ex typographia Aloisii Zannetti, Romae 1605, pp. 23-24 (later reproduced verbatim in the posthumous volume continuing Baronio’s *Annales ecclesiastici* by Abrahamus Bzovius, *Pius quintus romanus pontifex*, typis Michaelis Herculis, Romae 1672, col. 2), based on the account *Conclave di papa Pio V* (ASV, Miscell., II, 121, ff. 174r ff.; see also BAV, Urb. lat., 842, ff. 501r ff.; ibid., Vat. lat., 12181, ff. 732r ff.; 12183, ff. 120r ff.; 12184, ff. 51r ff.; 14203, ff. 307r ff.; 14379, ff. 176r ff.; FiAS, Mediceo, 3966, ff. 184r ff.; 3966a, ff. 73r ff.). See also Alessandro

Maffei, *Vita di san Pio quinto sommo pontefice dell'ordine de' predicatori*, presso Francesco Gonzaga, Rome 1712, a work published immediately after the pope's canonization, which refers only in passing to the alternative candidacies of Morone and Sirleto, "both men of eminent merit" (p. 62). Even in recent times, however, wholly uninformed reconstructions of the events have been proposed, such as that in Guy Bedouelle's textbook, *The Reform of Catholicism, 1480-1620*, Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, Rome 2008, p. 100: "At the death of Pius IV in 1565, many persons - among them Charles Borromeo and his circle of reformers - had hoped to elect the brilliant humanist and diplomat Giovanni Morone, who had been the papal legate to the council in its final phase. But, because there had been rumors in 1558 about Morone's orthodoxy and personal life, his supporters could not reach the majority" (italics added).

31. PrAS, *Raccolta manoscritti*, 20; see also ibid., Giuliano Mazzarelli's letter to the ducal secretary Giambattista Pico, dated in Rome on 12 December 1565. As appears from a dispatch of the Spanish ambassador Juan de Zúñiga of 2 January 1570, it would later also be said - though on what grounds is difficult to understand - that Morone's election had been prevented by a letter he had written to Paul III during the Bologna legation (SAG, Estado, 913, nos. 1-2).
32. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 96.
33. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 166r; see B. Hilliger, *Die Wahl Pius' V*, cited above, pp. 121 ff.; Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 20-21.
34. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 77-78.
35. Ibid., p. 84. In the same letter the ambassador reported that Spain's enemies had exerted strong pressure on Morone, telling him that although he had long served the Catholic king and had always been named among his candidates, the king had now not only failed to mention him but had supported his worst enemy, since the new pope was the man who had presided over his trial during the persecution he suffered under Paul IV. Since then there had always been very little cordiality between them (p. 82). On the satisfaction at Ghislieri's election at the Spanish court, see pp. 117-18, 122-23.
36. *Don Pedro Guerrero: epistolario y documentación*, edited by Juan López Martín, Instituto español de historia eclesiástica, Rome 1974, p. 138.
37. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 125r-127r.
38. RoBN, Fondo Vittorio Emanuele, ms 1009, *Cose notabili de' nostri tempi*, f. 154v.
39. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 596. On him we need only refer to the somewhat apologetic biography by N. Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, cited above, and to the proceedings of the many conferences held for the fifth centenary of his birth: M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo*, cited above; *Una città e il suo vescovo*, cited above; *Il tempo di Pio V. Pio V nel tempo*, proceedings of the conference (Bosco Marengo, Alessandria, 11-13 March 2004), edited by Fulvio Cervini and Carla Enrica Spantigati, Edizioni dell'Orso, Alessandria 2006; *Le carte del diritto e della fede*, proceedings of the conference (Alessandria, 16-17 June 2006), edited by Elisa Mongiano and Gian Maria Panizza, Società di storia, arte e archeologia - Accademia degli immobili, Alessandria 2008.
40. E. Bonora, *Morone e Pio IV*, cited above, pp. 50-51.
41. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 160; see Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 596; G. Catena, Vita, cited above, pp. 6 ff.
42. Processi Soranzo, vol. I, pp. XXVII ff.; M. Firpo, Vittore Soranzo, cited above, pp. 388 ff.
43. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 11.
44. BAV, Barb. lat., 1502, ff. 1-2, breve del 1o novembre del '55; see Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 32 ff.
45. Henry II of France had described him in these terms in June 1557, as appears from a dispatch by the Venetian ambassador (PM, vol. III, p. 164).

46. Pastor, vol. VI, pp. 518, 650, 665; see BAV, Urb. lat., 1038, f. 261v, a report from Rome of 4 September 1557: "Cardinal Fra Michele, speaking with the pope about peace, told him that there was no need for a jubilee to pray for peace, since it lay in his own hands to make it; whereupon His Holiness answered him harshly, driving him from his presence with very ugly words and calling him: 'Defrocked Lutheran friar!'"

47. PrAS, *Carteggio farnesiano estero. Roma*, 342, Vincenzo Buoncambi's letter to Ottavio Farnese of 5 August 1559; see also ibid., Marchio Valeri's contemporary letter to Alessandro Farnese and the Roman report of the same day (BAV, Urb. lat., 1039, f. 65r).

48. NaAS, *Carte farnesiane*, 260/I, f. 308r, Giulio Gallo's letter to Ottavio Farnese of 29 July 1559; see also ibid., f. 306v, the earlier letter of 5 July.

49. Mario Scaduto, *Tra inquisitori e riformati. Le missioni dei gesuiti tra i valdesi della Calabria e delle Puglie*, in Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu, XV (1946), pp. 44-45, 47, 55 of the offprint; on Ghislieri's role in the repression of the Waldensians, see P. Scaramella, *L'Inquisizione romana e i valdesi*, cited above, ad indicem; Id., *Pio V e la repressione dell'eresia in Italia meridionale*, cited above.

50. PM, vol. III, p. 294, note 567.

51. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 486-87; see the record of the *Introductio officii Inquisitionis in collegium cardinalium* in the consistorial acts (ASV, *Arch. concist. Acta vicecanc*., 8, f. 151v, under 14 December 1558); PM, vol. III, p. 267, note 489; Vincenzo Belo's Roman diary (BAV, Capponi, 63, f. 142r); *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 170.

52. Girolamo Catena, *Delle lettere volume primo*, appresso Iacopo Tornieri, in Roma 1589, p. 312.

53. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 132r-133v.

54. See above, section XVIII.2.

55. See above, section XVIII.1.

56. NB1, vol. V, p. 33. The day after that election Pasquino also lashed out at the cardinals, "infernal spirits […] | who have made Alessandrin, rogue and knave, | shepherd of Christ's holy fold, | to which Peter was the first successor. | […] | You have placed the Church in the hands of a cruel | friar" (*Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, p. 925).

57. *Legazioni di Averardo Serristori*, cited above, p. 422, letter of 23 January.

58. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 29.

59. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 95-96, letter of 22 January.

60. Ibid., p. 211. On Spain's exclusion of Morone's candidacy, see below, sections XXIII.2 and 4, XX.4, XXI.1.

61. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 136r-137v, Paolo Tiepolo's letter of 19 January 1566.

62. PrBP, ms Palatino, 1013, ff. 179r-180v, letters to Muzio Calini and Ludovico Ceresuola of 25 and 26 January 1566, and (ibid., 1017, ff. 11r-12r) to Giovanni Gondola of the 24th.

63. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 56.

64. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, ff. 169v-171r; see Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 594.

65. A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 118 ff., 225 ff.

66. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 172r. On 16 November it was reported that Diomede Carafa, who had inherited from his father Giovanni the title of Count of Montorio, "is still here, held in the highest favor by the pope: they say that twice His Holiness wept with him over the calamities of the house of Carafa and told him that he would never fail him" (ibid., f. 321r); and shortly afterward, on 8 December, that he was "so

caressed by the pope that he obtains every favor he asks because of the obligation His Holiness believes he owes to Paul IV" (ibid., f. 344r).

67. Giuseppe Cugnoni, *Autobiografia di monsignor G. Antonio Santori cardinale di S*. Severina, in Archivio della Società romana di storia patria, XII (1889), pp. 327-72; XIII (1890), pp. 151-205, especially p. 340; the inquisitorial correspondence between Ghislieri and Santoro in 1563-66 was edited by P. Scaramella, *Le lettere della congregazione del Sant'Ufficio*, cited above, pp. 3-21.

68. Regine Schallert, "Et novus ex solido revirescit marmore phoenix." Das Grabmonument *für Paul IV. in Santa Maria sopra Minerva*, in Joachim Poeschke, Britta Kusch, and Thomas Weigel (eds.), *Praemium Virtutis II. Grabdenkmäler und Begräbniszeremoniell in der italienischen Hoch- und Spätrenaissance*, Rhema, Münster 2005, pp. 201-7, especially p. 206.

69. See above, section XX.4.

70. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 196.

71. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 60.

72. BAV, Urb. lat. 1040, f. 344v; see A. Pampalone, *La statua capitolina di Paolo IV*, cited above, p. 206; R. Schallert, *«Et novus ex solido revirescit marmore phoenix»*, cited above, p. 217.

73. BAV, Urb. lat. 1040, f. 431r.

74. A Roman report of 24 February 1566 states that the pope had personally gone to Castel Sant'Angelo to "read the sentences issued against Cardinal Carafa and his brother the duke, and after reading them he remained suspended for more than an hour without speaking to anyone" (ibid., f. 190v).

75. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 130. On the rehabilitation of the Carafa, see Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 69, 93 ff.; R. Ancel, *La disgrâce et le procès des Carafa*, cited above, pp. 169 ff.; A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, pp. 126 ff.; M. Pattenden, *Pius IV and the Fall of the* Carafa, cited above, pp. 118 ff.

76. As early as 8 December 1566 a report from Rome stated that the pope intended to summon Pallantieri to account for the "Carafa affair, since he is resolved to have that entire judgment reviewed and, if possible, to reopen the sentences" (BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 344rv).

77. Ibid., 1042, f. 71r.

78. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, pp. 59-60.

79. BAV, Urb. lat. 1041, f. 385r.

80. a. Caracciolo, *De vita Pauli quarti pontificis maximi collectanea historica*, ex officina Ioannis Kinckii, Coloniae Ubiorum 1612, p. [**4]r.

81. Onofrio Panvinio would present him in these terms in his continuation of Platina's Lives of the Popes (*Historia delle vite*, cited above, p. 290).

82. R. Schallert, "Et novus ex solido revirescit marmore phoenix," cited above, pp. 223 ff.; Michele Miele, *Pio V e la presenza dei domenicani nel corso della sua vita*, in M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo*, cited above, pp. 27-48, especially pp. 46-47.

83. BAV, Urb. lat., 1039, f. 287r, report of 31 August 1566.

84. M. Firpo and F. Biferali, Navicula Petri, cited above, pp. 356 ff.

85. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 149.

86. M. Firpo and F. Biferali, Navicula Petri, cited above, pp. 363-64.

87. Halil Inalcik, *Lepanto in the Ottoman Documents*, in *Il Mediterraneo nella seconda metà del '500* alla luce di Lepanto, proceedings of the conference (Venice, 8-10 October 1971), edited by Gino Benzoni, Olschki, Florence 1974, pp. 193-213; Onur Yildirim, *La battaglia di Lepanto e il suo impatto sulla*

storia e la storiografia ottomane, in M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica*, cited above, pp. 321-52.

88. In addition to Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 574 ff., see Carlo Dionisotti, *Lepanto nella cultura italiana del tempo*, in *Il Mediterraneo nella seconda metà del '500*, cited above, pp. 127-51; Hubert Jedin, *Papst Pius V., die heilige Liga und der Kreuzzugsgedanke*, ibid., pp. 193-213; Paolo Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, Sansoni, Florence 1975, pp. 79 ff.; Letizia Pierozzi, *La vittoria di Lepanto nell'escatologia e nella profezia*, in Rinascimento, XXXIV (1994), pp. 317-63; N. Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, cited above, pp. 299 ff.; Michele Olivari, *Lepanto e il mito di don Giovanni d'Austria nell'opinione pubblica cattolica*, in M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica*, cited above, pp. 277-320; Marina Formica, *Giochi di specchi. Dinamiche identitarie e rappresentazioni del Turco nella cultura italiana del Cinquecento*, in Rivista storica italiana, CXX (2008), pp. 5-53, especially pp. 30 ff.; Alessandro Barbero, *Lepanto. La battaglia dei tre imperi*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2010; Giovanni Ricci, *Papa Pio V fra spirito di crociata e politica internazionale*, in *San Pio V nella storia*, cited above, pp. 13-21.

89. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 181.

90. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 40, note 8; N. Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, cited above, pp. 219 ff.

91. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 593-94; see pp. 597-98; Sible de Blaauw, *Pio V, la liturgia e le chiese antiche di Roma*, in *Il tempo di Pio V*, cited above, pp. 79-103, especially pp. 79 ff.

92. BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 9v.

93. RoBN, Fondo Vittorio Emanuele, ms 1009, *Cose notabili de' nostri tempi*, f. 109v.

94. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 4 and note 6.

95. Roberto Rusconi, *Il primato della santità: la Controriforma e il culto dei papi*, in A. Prosperi, P. Schiera, and G. Zarri (eds.), *Chiesa cattolica e mondo moderno*, cited above, pp. 47-64, especially p. 52. On the myth of sanctity, see Miguel Gotor, *Le vite di san Pio V dal 1572 al 1712 tra censura, agiografia e storia*, in M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo*, cited above, pp. 207-49.

96. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 179-80.

97. *Briefe von Andreas Masius*, cited above, p. 405.

98. BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, ff. 76v-77r.

99. Marco Penzi, *La politica francese di Pio V: tra riforma cattolica e guerra contro l'eresia*, in M. Guasco and A. Torre (eds.), *Pio V nella società e nella politica del suo tempo*, cited above, pp. 251-76.

100. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 263 ff.

101. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 200-2.

102. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 489.

103. *Legazioni di Averardo Serristori*, cited above, p. 420.

104. Michela Catto, *Un panopticon catechistico. L'arciconfraternita della dottrina cristiana a Roma in età moderna*, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 2003, pp. 93 ff.

105. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 124 ff.; *Briefe von Andreas Masius*, cited above, p. 374

106. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 118 ff.

107. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 171 ff.

108. Fulvio Cervini, Pio V, Vasari e l'arte "medievale," in *Il tempo di Pio V*, cited above, pp. 193-218, especially pp. 195-96.

109. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 60 ff., 599-603, 611, 613-14.

110. A. Milano, *Storia degli ebrei in Italia*, cited above, pp. 247 ff.; M. Caffiero, *Storia degli ebrei nell'Italia moderna*, cited above, pp. 100 ff.; N. Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, cited above, pp. 241 ff.

111. See above, section XX.6.

112. PM, vol. III, p. 351.

113. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 51.

114. BAV, Vat. lat., 6436, f. 269v, report of 14 February 1568.

115. Paolo Simoncelli, *Inquisizione romana e Riforma in Italia*, in Rivista storica italiana, C (1988), pp. 5-125, especially pp. 114 ff.

116. NB2, vol. V, p. 34.

117. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 96 and notes 7-8.

118. *Briefe von Andreas Masius*, cited above, p. 374.

119. M. Miele, *Pio V e la presenza dei domenicani*, cited above, pp. 40-41.

120. Ibid., p. 39; see E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 54-55; and above, section VIII.2.

121. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 54.

122. P. J. Laven, *The «Causa» Grimani*, cited above, p. 204.

123. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 184 ff.; see also vol. VII, pp. 2-7.

124. See below, section XXI.5.

125. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 36.

126. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. XII-XIV.

127. Ibid., pp. XV ff., CXXXVII ff.

128. See above, section VI.3.

129. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 225, note 3.

130. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 131.

131. SAG, Estado, 913, nos. 83, 91-93, letters to Philip II and Maximilian II of 25 January 1570.

132. See the detailed account of the ceremony by the papal diarist Cornelio Firmano, published by A. Maffei, *Vita di san Pio quinto*, cited above, pp. 233 ff.

133. See above, sections VI.3 and XXI.2.

134. See above, section XVIII.3.

135. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 2, f. 303r.

136. S. Lo Re, *Ambrogio Catarino Politi*, cited above, pp. 16 ff.

137. BAV, Vat. lat., 6436, f. 420r, report of 21 June 1567. "Tomorrow at the Minerva," it was written from Rome to Mantua on 3 January 1568, for example, "thirty heretics will abjure, and His Holiness grants ten years and I do not know how many forty-day indulgences to anyone present" (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 900, f. 408). Roman reports repeatedly mentioned at that time the "usual abjuration at the Minerva" (BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, ff. 483r, 488r, 545v, 551v; ibid., 1043, f. 32r); see Carlo De Frede, *Autodafé ed esecuzioni di eretici a Roma*, now in Id., *Religiosità e cultura*, cited above, pp. 297-343, especially pp. 314 ff.

138. *Pasquino. Cinquecento pasquinate*, cited above, p. 259.

139. *Pasquinate romane del Cinquecento*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 912, 918-19, 925, 937; see also *Pasquinate del Cinque e Seicento*, cited above, p. 270; PRO, State Papers, 85/1, f. 17r.

140. Michele Rosi, *La Riforma religiosa in Liguria e l'eretico umbro Bartolomeo Bartoccio*, in Atti della Società ligure di storia patria, XXIV (1894), pp. 555-726; see p. 615.

141. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 198-99; more generally, see pp. 197 ff.; *Briefe von Andreas Masius*, cited above, p. 405.

142. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 36.

143. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 198-99; G. Maifreda, *I denari dell'inquisitore*, cited above

144. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 180v; see *Bullarium diplomatum*, cited above, vol. VII, pp. 422-23, the bull by which the newly elected pontiff imposed universal obedience to the Congregation of the Holy Office.

145. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. II, p. 115; see also Cardinal Zaccaria Dolfin's letter to the Duke of Mantua, dated in Rome on 20 January 1568, in which he likewise stressed that, especially in "matters of the Inquisition," no cardinal dared "oppose the pope's will in anything whatsoever" (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 900, p. 74).

146. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 234.

147. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 172, 191, 202; see p. 201: "He has not abandoned the exercise of the Inquisition that he practiced as a private cardinal. […] He would sooner abandon anything else than that, considering all other matters of less value and less importance."

148. G. Fragnito, *Pio V e la censura*, cited above, p. 141; see the following pages; Id., *La Bibbia al rogo*, cited above, pp. 111 ff.

149. Gigliola Fragnito, *Vescovi "censori": il Tridentino alla prova*, in Gian Paolo Brizzi and Giuseppe Olmi (eds.), *Dai cantieri della storia. Liber amicorum per Paolo Prodi*, Clueb, Bologna 2007, pp. 25-35.

150. BAV, Urb. lat. 1040, ff. 304rv, 322r; VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 132r-133v.

151. Aldo Stella, *Guido da Fano eretico del secolo XVI al servizio del re d'Inghilterra*, in Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, XIII (1959), pp. 196-238, especially p. 228; Guido Dall'Olio, *Giannetti, Guido*, in DBI, vol. LIV, pp. 453-55; on his relations with England, see Anne Overell, Italian Reform and English Reformation c. 1535-c. 1585, Ashgate, Aldershot 2008, ad indicem.

152. NB2, vol. V, p. 33.

153. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, pp. 9, 50.

154. Girolamo Muzio, *Catholica disciplina di prencipi*, Al segno del pozzo, in Vinegia 1561, p. 2r.

155. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 51; see pp. 62-63, notes 9, 13.

156. Ibid., pp. 56, 191.

157. Ibid., p. 9; M. Rosi, *La Riforma religiosa in Liguria*, cited above, p. 642.

158. On 18 October 1567 Morone himself was called to testify in Carranza's trial, together with Ludovico Simonetta, who had also served as legate at Trent four years earlier, concerning the council's "alleged approval" of his catechism (José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, *El proceso romano del arzobispo Carranza (1567-1576)*, Iglesia nacional española, Rome 1988, p. 187).

159. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 214 ff.; Id., *Allgemeine Dekrete*, cited above, pp. 30-31; see M. Firpo, *Juan de Valdés e la Riforma*, cited above, ad indicem.

160. H. Bullinger, *Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, cited above, vol. III, p. 74.

161. Théodore de Bèze, *Correspondance*, vol. IX, Droz, Genève 1978, p. 47.

162. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 197 ff.; N. Lemaître, *Saint Pie V*, cited above, pp. 257 ff. For Modena, Morone's diocese, see below, section XXII.4.

163. A. Prosperi, *Tribunali della coscienza*, cited above, pp. 112 ff.

164. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 200; Romolo Quazza, *La diplomazia gonzaghesca*, Istituto per gli studi di politica internazionale, Milan 1941, p. 10, letter sent by Camillo Luzzara to Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga on 9 January 1566.

165. BAV, Urb. lat., 1041, f. 298r, reports of 5 and 19 July 1570, which announced his elevation to that office after Cardinal Pisani's death.

166. Ibid., f. 251r, report of 1 April 1570; VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 1, ff. 426v-427r.

167. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 171r; see Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 594.

168. After reporting the affair on 25 May 1566 and specifying that the pope had immediately understood it to be a "calumny" and had the responsible parties imprisoned "with the intention that they be severely punished," the Venetian ambassador gave the more detailed information summarized here in his next dispatch of 1 June (VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 1, ff. 167v, 171v-173v, 196v-197r; ibid., Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 292r-294v); see the letter of 29 July in which the Bishop of Bitonto, Cornelio Musso, wrote to Morone rejoicing at his escape from danger and expressing certainty that "this trouble, despite the sons of Esau, will have brought your goodness to light; like a coal beneath ashes, had they not stirred it, it might perhaps have remained buried throughout this pontificate" (BAV, Borgh. lat., 300, f. 305v; see also ibid., Urb. lat., 1040, f. 222r).

169. G. Catena, Vita, cited above, p. 37: "It was revealed to Pius through the lieutenant of his guard, named Paolo Maria Castellani, that two men from Castellaccio, a village near Bosco, had told him that they had been solicited, with very large offers, both orally and by letters in Cardinal Morone's name, to murder Pius; and they produced so many indications that they might have sufficed to arouse the pontiff's mind to proceed against Morone. Yet he realized that this must be an imposture, and after speaking with Morone, without wishing to cause him any trouble, he discreetly had the lieutenant bring those men to Rome. There, compelled to tell the truth, they said that the cause of their wicked act had been the hope of gaining great rewards; but instead they received, as they well deserved, public punishment"; see also I. A. Gabutius, *De vita et rebus gestis Pii V*, cited above, pp. 224-25: "Indeed Pius always held Morone himself in the highest esteem, as a man outstanding in supreme prudence and experience of affairs, and gladly made use of his prudent counsel in carrying out the weightiest matters."

170. *Legazioni di Averardo Serristori*, cited above, pp. 424-25.

171. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 897, ff. 74v-75r; see BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 359v.

172. *Bullarium diplomatum*, cited above, vol. VI, pp. 499-502, whose text - as indicated by Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 202-3 - must be supplemented by that published by Giacomo Laderchi, *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1566, ubi Odericus Raynaldus desinit*, vol. XXII, typis et sumptibus Hieronymi Mainardi, Romae 1728, pp. 41-42 (no. 95); see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 497-99.

173. See above, section XVII.1.

174. *Legazioni di Averardo Serristori*, cited above, p. 436.

175. PM, vol. III, pp. 439 ff.

176. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 207.

177. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 410.

178. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 449 ff.; Id., *Teologia, storia e politica nell'ultimo processo*, cited above, pp. 227 ff.; S. Ricci, *Il sommo inquisitore*, cited above, pp. 221 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 198 ff.

179. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 322-23, 344-45 e passim.

180. Ibid., pp. 686-87.

181. Ibid., p. 1342.

182. Ibid., pp. 1254, 1259.

183. Ibid., p. 1245; see pp. 1346-50.

184. FiAS, Mediceo, 3592, ff. 107r, 108r.

185. Ibid., f. 115v.

186. Ibid., ff. 121v-122r.

187. Ibid., 3286, f. 163r.

188. A. Stella, *Guido da Fano*, cited above, p. 227; see also pp. 228-29: "His Holiness has desired to have no one else in his hands as much as Carnesecchi and this man, but this man even more than Carnesecchi," the Venetian ambassador wrote, stressing that "this Guido Zanetti […] is named by almost all the heretics who have been before the Inquisition, […] and therefore […] more can be extracted from this man than from any other."

189. FiAS, Mediceo, 3286, f. 163r.

190. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. XXVII ff. As late as 1577 the mutual hostility between Morone and Gambara would be evoked in a letter by the Bishop of Brescia, Domenico Bollani (Christopher Cairns, Domenico Bollani Bishop of Brescia. Devotion to Church and State in the Republic of Venice in the Sixteenth Century, B. De Graaf, Nieuwkoop 1976, p. 381).

191. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 52.

192. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 19, ff. 217r-220v, edited in *Storia arcana ed aneddotica d'Italia raccontata dai veneti ambasciatori*, edited by Fabio Mutinelli, 2 vols., Pietro Naratovich, Venice 1855, vol. I, pp. 72-75; for what follows, see also *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. CXXX ff.

193. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 898, f. 487rv; for what follows, see also *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. CXXXIX ff.

194. FiAS, Mediceo, 3593, f. 146r.

195. P. Simoncelli, *Evangelismo italiano*, cited above, pp. 466-67; see *Processi Carnesecchi*, pp. CXLIII ff.

196. FiAS, Mediceo, 3593, ff. 140v-141r.

197. Ibid., f. 150r.

198. S. Pagano, *Il processo*, cited above, p. 115.

199. Ibid., pp. 141 ff. and 225 ff., the critical edition of the trial records.

200. Ibid., pp. 144-45.

201. Ibid., p. 146; see also p. 153.

202. Ibid., pp. 293-96; see also p. 344.

203. Ibid., p. 298.

204. Ibid., p. 147; but see pp. 155-56, note 45.

205. Ibid., pp. 329 ff., 339-40, 343 ff.

206. Ibid., pp. 150-51.

207. Ibid., pp. 189, 192; see p. 207.

208. VeAS, Senato. Archivi propri degli ambasciatori. Roma, 18, ff. 134r-135v, Paolo Tiepolo's letter of January 1566.

209. A. Gardi, *Pietro Antonio Di Capua*, cited above, pp. 300 ff.

210. L. Amabile, Il Santo Officio, cited above, vol. I, pp. 182-83.

211. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, ff. 518v, 542v.

212. Ibid., ff. 537r, 544v, 561r, reports of 21 April, 1 May, and 19 June 1568.

213. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 2, f. 496r, letter of 28 February 1568.

214. Ibid., 3, f. 8r.

215. Ibid., ff. 46v-47r, letter of 27 March. "His Holiness," Tiepolo wrote on 3 April, "[…] has resolved to hear his case himself without entrusting it to anyone else" (ibid., f. 60r); see also the letter of 17 April: "The affair of the Archbishop of Otranto is proceeding in a very extraordinary manner, thus far in his favor, because His Holiness himself is dealing with him without involving any of the Inquisition; meanwhile he remains at liberty and goes wherever he wishes" (ibid., f. 83v).

216. See below, section XXII.4.

217. BAV, Vat. lat., 6436, ff. 87v-88r.

218. MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 1500 and 1687, reports sent to the Duke of Mantua from Venice and Rome on 13 and 24 May.

219. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Di Capua Pietro Antonio; see A. Gardi, *Pietro Antonio Di Capua*, cited above, pp. 303-4.

220. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 2, ff. 321v-322r, Michele Surian's letter of 6 November 1568; see also BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 645v, the report of 13 November.

221. MoBE, Autografoteca Campori, Di Capua Pietro Antonio; see also the letter of 1 August.

222. BAV, Urb. lat., 1041, f. 41rv, report of 12 March 1569; see f. 170r, which shows that his dismissal took place on 25 October 1569.

223. PM, vol. III, p. 772, note f.

224. Ibid., pp. 10-13.

225. Ibid., p. 542.

226. For what follows, see also ibid., pp. 543 ff.; S. Pagano and C. Ranieri, Nuovi documenti, cited above, pp. 49 ff.

227. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, p. 918; see p. 837.

228. PM, vol. III, pp. 548 ff.

229. Ibid., p. 301.

230. FiAS, Mediceo, 537, f. 8rv; partially published by Gigliola Fragnito, Vittoria *Colonna e l'Inquisizione*, in Benedictina, XXXVII (1990), pp. 157-72, especially p. 161. The information supplied by Ceresuola repeated almost word for word what can be read in a Roman report translated into Spanish and sent shortly before to Madrid (SAG, Estado, 908, nos. 120-21).

231. PM, vol. III, p. 855, note 15.

232. P. Lopez, *Il movimento valdesiano a Napoli*, cited above

233. See below, section XXII.4.

234. A. Stella, *Guido da Fano*, cited above, p. 237.

235. A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, p. 152; but see more generally pp. 130 ff., 167 ff.

236. A. Mercati, *I costituti di Niccolò Franco*, cited above, pp. 126-27.

237. Ibid., p. 13.

238. Ibid., p. 102.

239. Ibid., pp. 132, 156.

240. Ibid., pp. 133, 172.

241. Ibid., pp. 168, 171-72.

242. Ibid., pp. 101, 121; see pp. 110, 113, 116, 118-21.

243. Ibid., pp. 180-81; see also p. 184.

244. Ibid., p. 136; see above, sections X.2, XII.4, XIV.1, XV.5, and XVI.1.

245. BAV, Urb. lat., 1041, f. 238r.

246. J. I. Tellechea Idígoras, *Contarini, Pole, Morone*, cited above, pp. 295-96; but see the edition in PM, vol. III, pp. 575 ff., especially p. 616.

247. PM, vol. III, pp. 582-83.

248. Ibid., pp. 586, 593.

XXII. "Today Is a Time Only for Severity and Punishment." Still on Trial and Still Bishop of Modena

1. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 172; see P. Simoncelli, *Inquisizione romana e Riforma in Italia*, cited above, pp. 87-89.

2. This was written to Mantua at the end of May 1568 (MnAS, Archivio Gonzaga, 900, f. 500r).

3. A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, p. 152, note 112; for what follows, see also S. Ricci, *Il sommo inquisitore*, cited above, pp. 232 ff.

4. BoBA, ms B. 1859, *Consilia et acta in materia Sancti Officii*, ff. 35r-88r, edited in PM, vol. III, pp. 626 ff.

5. PM, vol. III, pp. 660, 677.

6. Ibid., pp. 700, 705.

7. Ibid., p. 699.

8. See ibid., pp. LXXI ff.

9. Ibid., p. 680.

10. Ibid., pp. 630-40.

11. A similar observation was also made by Castellani, Sirenio, and Anguissola (ibid., pp. 654, 681, 693).

12. Ibid., p. 640.

13. Ibid., pp. 640-44.

14. Ibid., pp. 644-47.

15. Ibid., pp. 648-65.

16. Ibid., pp. 665-74.

17. Ibid., pp. 674-80.

18. Ibid., pp. 680-92.

19. Ibid., pp. 693-99.

20. Ibid., pp. 699-705.

21. Ibid., pp. 705 ff.

22. The critical edition is ibid., pp. 713 ff.

23. In a dispatch to the Florentine court of 10 October 1569, Babbi commented on Gheri's testimony against Franco by stressing that the trial was based not on suspicions of a religious nature, but solely on "the death of the Carafa, because the bishop was the one who carried their trial records to the Catholic king." This suggested that Morone and other cardinals "who showed themselves partisan and curious about their death may also suffer some trouble, especially Morone, who, having been injured by them, made every vigorous effort for their death" (A. Aubert, *Paolo IV. Politica, Inquisizione*, cited above, p. 152, note 112).

24. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 247.

25. On him (1533-1582), who was closely attached to Spain, where he carried out numerous diplomatic missions, and who later became Bishop of Vigevano, see Gian Paolo Brizzi's entry *Casali, Alessandro*, in DBI, vol. XXI, pp. 57-60; PM, vol. II, p. 794, note 12.

26. SAG, Estado, 900, no. 157, *El discurso de Alexandro Casal*.

27. See above, section XXI.3.

28. MiAS, *Autografi. Ecclesiastici*, 30, f. 1r, letter sent by Morone on 26 March 1569 to Alfonso II Del Carretto, Marquis of Finale and Genoese ambassador at the imperial court.

29. See below, section XXIV.3.

30. PM, vol. III, pp. 852 ff.

31. See above, section XVIII.1.

32. Since it is impossible to summarize the enormous bibliography on the subject, we need only mention a few recent studies of emblematic reforming bishops of the Tridentine age: W. de Boer, *La conquista dell'anima*, cited above; F. Buzzi and D. Zardin (eds.), Carlo Borromeo e l'opera della "Grande Riforma," cited above; *Carlo Borromeo e il cattolicesimo dell'età moderna: nascita e fortuna di un modello di santità*, proceedings of the study days (25-27 November 2010), edited by Maria Luisa Frosio and Danilo Zardin, in Studia borromaica, XXV (2011); Elisabetta Patrizi, *Pastoralità ed educazione. L'episcopato di Agostino Valier nella Verona post-tridentina (1565-1606). I. Vita e azione pastorale*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2015; P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti*, cited above; C. Cairns, Domenico Bollani, cited above; Cecilia Nubola, *Conoscere per governare. La diocesi di Trento nella visita pastorale di Ludovico Madruzzo (1579-1581)*, il Mulino, Bologna 1993; and the proceedings *Il concilio di Trento nella vita spirituale e culturale del Mezzogiorno tra XVI e XVII secolo*, edited by Gabriele De Rosa and Antonio Cestaro, 2 vols., Osanna, Venosa 1988. For a comparative perspective, a useful starting point is Jennifer Mara DeSilva (ed.), *Episcopal Reform and Politics in Early Modern Europe*, Truman State University Press, Kirksville, Missouri, 2012.

33. See above, section VII.1.

34. M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above; Id., *I vescovi riformatori*, cited above, pp. 106-20; see above, section III.1.

35. See the exhibition catalogue *L'uomo del concilio*, cited above.

36. M. Al Kalak, *I vescovi riformatori*, cited above, p. 116; on Foscarari, see Id., *Il riformatore dimenticato*, cited above.

37. BAV, Urb. lat. 1042, f. 151v.

38. See below, section XXII.2.

39. See above, section III.2. In mid-April 1571, when Morone asked permission to go to Ostia and Velletri and then to Lucca, the pontiff replied "that he is content as to the first part of the request, but reserves permission for the second until after His Illustrious Lordship returns to Rome, unless there is some special need for his person" (BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 216v).

40. See below, section XXIII.1.

41. See the example discussed by E. Patrizi, *Pastoralità ed educazione*, cited above, p. 72.

42. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, especially pp. XI-XII.

43. In addition to Paolo Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice. Un corpo e due anime: la monarchia papale nella prima età moderna*, il Mulino, Bologna 1982, pp. 251 ff., see U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, pp. 79-83.

44. See the letter addressed to Morone on 17 June 1566 by Fra Reginaldo Nerli, then a collaborator of Paleotti: “I feel such great sorrow in the depths of my heart over the incredible poverty of our most illustrious Cardinal Paleotti and his brothers that I am compelled - though very unwillingly - to trouble Your Most Illustrious Lordship with this letter and to take upon myself the intolerable burden of writing, for which I am far less suited than I ever was for jousting. Yesterday, while I was with Messer Camillo [Paleotti] and heard of the difficulty in finding the money to pay the pension due in eight days, such anguish seized my soul that I could never express it. This servant of God, as poor as he is good, as straitened in all things pertaining to the life of this world as he is generous and prodigal in all things pertaining to the office and care of his bishopric, receives so little from the revenues of his bishopric that he could not buy a pair of shoes, so burdened is it with pensions. […] I see the good cardinal living with such modesty that the smallest income would suffice him, but it is too much not to have enough to eat. He has only three mounts, a very small household, and when he leaves home on business he uses his brother’s coach, since the dignity of his rank does not allow him to go out otherwise. If the Holiness of Our Lord knew his great and extreme need, together with his incredible labors for the salvation of souls, I am certain that he would treat him no less liberally than he treats the others. Indeed, I believe he would treat him even better, for I do not believe there is another church in all Christendom better supplied with a bishop than this one of Bologna. I know of nothing Cardinal Paleotti lacks except the revenues of his bishopric, which are more than necessary for him and his poor children” (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 54r).

45. “I cannot deny that some of his [Pius V’s] ministers,” Paleotti wrote to Morone on 7 June 1567, “whether through malicious reports, unfounded imaginings, or however it may be, give me little cause to be satisfied with them; and this is nothing new, for ever since I came into residence the same conduct has been continually maintained by one minister or another. […] At times I have remained here for three consecutive months without ever receiving an answer to any of my letters” (U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, pp. 258-59; P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 270 ff., 328 ff.).

46. The Bishop of Bologna also wrote to Morone about this in December 1569 (U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, p. 277).

47. As an example of Paleotti’s confidential correspondence with the Milanese cardinal, consider the letter he sent him on 20 December 1572, asking him “out of your kindness to read the enclosed papers, […] treating it as though you were granting me a half-hour audience in your chamber, as in your benevolence you have so often done” (P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti*, cited above, vol. II, p. 368, note 112).

48. Camillo Paleotti, the cardinal’s brother, devoted himself energetically to the city government - he served seven times as gonfalonier of justice between 1541 and 1594 - and in 1567 this brought him into conflict with the pope and his representative in Bologna, leading to a bitter ten-year suspension from his office as senator (Irene Iarocci, *Paleotti, Camillo*, in DBI, vol. LXXX, pp. 427-29). See Gabriele Paleotti’s letter to Morone of 16 April 1567 asking him to take charge of the case against his brother (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 176r); see also f. 188r; P. Prodi, *Il sovrano pontefice*, cited above, pp. 258-72.

49. Adriano Prosperi, *La Chiesa di Roma: il papato e la riforma tridentina nel Cinquecento*, in Vincenzo Lavenia (ed.), *Storia del cristianesimo*, vol. III, *L’età moderna (secoli XVI-XVIII)*, Carocci, Rome 2015, pp. 183-212, especially p. 206; see Claudio Donati, *Vescovi e diocesi d’Italia dall’età post-tridentina alla caduta dell’Antico Regime*, in Mario Rosa (ed.), *Clero e società nell’Italia moderna*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1992, pp. 320-89; Id., *Chiesa italiana e vescovi d’Italia dal XVI al XVII secolo. Tra interpretazioni storiografiche e prospettive di ricerca*, in Annali dell’Istituto storico italo-germanico di Trento, XXX (2004), pp. 375-89, especially p. 385.

50. U. Mazzone, *Governare lo Stato e curare le anime*, cited above, p. 78; see Giuseppe Alberigo, *Carlo Borromeo come modello di vescovo nella Chiesa post-tridentina*, in Rivista storica italiana, LXXIX (1967), pp. 1031-52. On Saint Charles’s canonization, see A. Turchini, *La fabbrica di un santo*, cited above. On the exceptional character of Borromeo’s figure, see E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, pp. 289-96 (see p. 294).

51. On that occasion Morone reached Bologna on 29 June (Giovanni Battista Marescalchi, *Cronaca 1561-1573*, edited by Ilaria Francica, introductory essay by Armando Antonelli and Riccardo Pedrini, Costa, Bologna 2002, p. 31). On 4 July, having reached Modena, he wrote to the Este duke that he had come "to dispatch the needs of this church of mine, so as to fulfill my office at least in part" (PrAS, *Carteggio* farnesiano estero, 333).

52. Morone reached Bologna on 23 February and was welcomed by Paleotti (G. B. Marescalchi, Cronaca, cited above, p. 61); on 1 March he informed Alessandro Farnese that he was in Modena (PrAS, *Carteggio* farnesiano estero, 334).

53. Morone was back in Rome by 29 May (BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 557r), perhaps after a brief visit to Milan.

54. See his letter to Ottavio Farnese of 17 July (PrAS, *Carteggio* farnesiano estero, 334). The cardinal had left Rome on 8 May and, after stopping at Sutri, where his nephew Girolamo Gallarati had recently taken office as the new bishop, went to Lucca "to take the waters at Bagni," though with little benefit to his health; he was still there on 7 July (BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, ff. 53v, 85v). On 2 July the Este resident in Rome reported his intention "to go and spend the hot months in Modena, where he will conduct a visitation of that church and a council, which will keep him so occupied that he will not be able to return here before the beginning of November" (MoAS, *Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma*, 84, fasc. 364, Galeazzo Fantuzzi's letter to the Duke of Ferrara). On 23 September he was at Sutri on the return journey, after passing through Florence (ibid.).

55. By 8 October Morone was already back in Rome (BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 131v; see MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. IV, ff. 29r-48v; ibid., fasc. V, ff. 19r-26v).

56. BAV, Urb. lat., 1041, ff. 258r, 275v.

57. A. Borromeo, *I vescovi italiani*, cited above, p. 38.

58. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, ff. 87r-88v; see PM, vol. I, pp. 30-31.

59. See above, section XIX.5.

60. MoAC, Capitolo, 109.

61. On his conflicts with his uncle during the conciliar debates over the *ius divinum*, see above, section XIX.4.

62. G. A. Chenna, *Del vescovato, de' vescovi e delle chiese*, cited above, pp. 282-86.

63. The correspondence is summarized in Gallarati's letter to Morone, dated in Alessandria on 2 November 1566, from which the quotation is taken (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 110r; see also ibid., ff. 112r-115v, Gallarati's long letter of the 7th describing the many problems of the Cistercian abbey of Tortona, which he had recently visited without, however, being able to meet either Bishop Cesare Gambara or his vicar; Silvano Giordano, *Gambara, Cesare*, in DBI, vol. LII [1999], pp. 37-38).

64. MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. IV, f. 1r.

65. See above, section III.1.

66. MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, fasc. IV, ff. 7r-9v, letters of 8 March and 12 April 1561, with the duke's reply in ibid., fasc. VI, ff. 9r, 11r.

67. Ibid., fasc. IV, f. 15r, letter of 22 May 1562. In April 1563 Morone visited the Duke of Ferrara on his way to Trent (ibid., f. 21r, letter of 3 April 1563).

68. Ibid., f. 25rv, letter of 7 June 1564.

69. Ibid., f. 27r, letter of 24 February 1565.

70. Ibid., f. 25rv, letter of 7 June 1564.

71. Ibid., fasc. VI, ff. 10r, 14r, letters to Morone of 2 November 1561 and undated.

72. Ibid., f. 13r, draft letter to Morone of 9 January 1565. In a draft of 14 February 1565 Alfonso II proposed the alternative "of submitting to your most prudent consideration Father Fra Camillo Campeggio, inquisitor of my State, and, should he seem to you a suitable subject, conferring the bishopric upon him" (ibid., f. 15r).

73. See the cautions set out by Silvio Ferrari, *I sinodi diocesani in Italia: criteri metodologici per il loro studio*, in Ius canonicum, XXXIII (1993), no. 66, pp. 713-33. For a general census, a useful starting point is Silvino Da Nadro, *Sinodi diocesani italiani. Catalogo bibliografico degli atti a stampa 1534-1878*, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1960.

74. *Constitutiones in synodo mutinensi sub illustrissimo et reverendissimo in Christo patre domino Ioanne miseratione divina episcopo portuensi sanctaeque romanae Ecclesiae cardinali Morono nuncupato et ecclesiae mutinensis perpetuo administratore editae et publicatae*, apud haeredes Cornelii Gadaldini, Mutinae 1565; see E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 372 ff. The copy preserved in BAV, Barberini, C. VII. 62, is bound together with the *Bolla del santissimo signor nostro Pio per divina providenza papa quinto letta nel Giovedí santo, giorno della cena del Signore dell'anno*, s.i.t., in Modona 1569 (which, among other things, reaffirmed the penalties against heretics and their supporters: pp. 1r-2v), and with the *Constitutiones additae synodo mutinensi*, apud Paulum Gadaldinum et fratres, Mutinae [1568], consisting of eight pages numbered only on the recto; and finally with the *Constitutiones novissimae synodi mutinensis celebrati in ecclesia cathedrali die 21 mensis Augusti anni 1571 sub illustrissimo et reverendissimo domino Ioanne cardinale Morono nuncupato, et collegii reverendissimorum dominorum cardinalium priore ac episcopatus Mutinae perpetuo administratore*, apud Paulum Gadaldinum et fratres, Mutinae 1571.

75. Angelo Turchini, *Monumenta borromaica*, V. Per gli "acta conciliorum" (1565-1582) *della provincia ecclesiastica di Milano. Svolgimento e materiali dall'usura alle feste su Milano e le altre realtà diocesane*, Il Ponte vecchio, Cesena 2016, p. 48.

76. Giuseppe Russo, *Il primo sinodo modenese dopo il concilio di Trento*, in Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi, s. X, III (1968), pp. 117-24, especially p. 118; G. Pistoni, *Le visite pastorali a Modena*, cited above, pp. 111-16; M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, pp. 24 ff.; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 210 ff.

77. "Residence is so necessary that without it no care of souls can exist and there can be nothing good in the Church of God" (M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, pp. 25-26).

78. See below, section XXII.4.

79. M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, p. 28.

80. Ibid., pp. 28-29, 45; see Riccardo Fangarezzi, *La moralità del clero e il cardinal Morone in un capitolo del sinodo modenese del 1565*, in Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le antiche provincie modenesi, s. XI, XIII (1991), pp. 107-24.

81. Giuseppe Tuninetti, *I seminari diocesani di Torino. Dal concilio di Trento (1563) al concilio Vaticano II (1965) tra memoria e storia*, Effatà, Torino 2013, p. 20.

82. Among the very first Italian seminaries established after Trent was that of Ventimiglia, founded in 1564 at the wish of Bishop Carlo Visconti - formerly a Milanese senator and created cardinal in March of the following year - whom Morone assisted, and perhaps financed, in constructing the cathedral choir (Girolamo Rossi, *Storia della città di Ventimiglia dalle sue origini sino ai nostri tempi*, Tipografia Cerutti, Derossi e Dusso, Turin 1859, p. 253).

83. MoAC, Capitolo, 109.

84. G. Tuninetti, *I seminari diocesani di Torino*, cited above, pp. 47-51.

85. Luca Testa, *Fondazione e primo sviluppo del Seminario romano (1565-1608)*, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Rome 2002, p. 23. Among the boarders at the Roman Seminary in 1573 was Vittorio

Machiavelli, Pompeo's nephew, admitted on Morone's recommendation; on that occasion the cardinal also helped secure admission for an Innocenzo Fontana, probably a member of the Modenese family (ibid., pp. 609-10). In 1575 Morone presented a Donato Rovelli, certainly related to his namesake, Morone's servant and testamentary executor (PM, vol. II, p. 932), and in 1576 a Pirro Machiavelli, likewise probably a relative of Pompeo.

86. A. Prosperi, *Eresie e devozioni*, cited above, vol. II, p. 37, notes the distinctive character of the Modenese experience.

87. Matteo Al Kalak, "La chiesa sta malissimo." Giovanni Morone e le cure di una diocesi post-tridentina, in Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia, LXVII (2013), pp. 131-64, especially pp. 136-37.

88. See above, sections VIII.1-2.

89. M. Al Kalak, "La chiesa sta malissimo," cited above, p. 139, letter of 31 December 1563. Evidence of the even informal overlap of jurisdictions is provided by a letter from Giovan Battista Capelli to Morone of 20 November 1566, asking him to intercede with the pope for the assignment of a pension of 100 scudi on the abbey of Nonantola that Borromeo had promised him (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 127r).

90. M. Al Kalak, *«La chiesa sta malissimo»*, cited above, p. 162.

91. Ibid., pp. 140-43. Of the seventy-four abuses recorded by the visitor, 62 percent concerned relations with women or the presence of children born of illicit relationships (ibid., p. 146).

92. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 114 ff.

93. Ibid., p. 120.

94. *Constitutiones in synodo mutinensi*, cited above, pp. 28, 30-33, 38-41, 43-44.

95. Ibid., pp. 58, 61, 112, 114-15.

96. Ibid., pp. 150-81; see pp. 179-80, for the restrictive provisions concerning Jews.

97. M. T. Rebucci, *Le visite pastorali*, cited above

98. M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, p. 63.

99. E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 541-55.

100. M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, p. 63, pp. 64-68; M. T. Rebucci, *Le visite pastorali*, cited above, pp. 106-10.

101. See above, note 74.

102. Juan de Zúñiga wrote this to Philip II on 29 October 1574 (SAG, Estado, 923, no. 15; see BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 216v; ibid., 1043, f. 343r); see Alessandro Borgia, *Istoria della chiesa e città di Velletri*, 2 vols., per Antonio Mariotti, Nocera 1723, vol. II, p. 446; A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 211.

103. See his letters to Ludovico Beccadelli of 22 August and 29 September 1562, the second written at Palestrina itself (PrBP, ms Palatino, 1020/1).

104. Adriano Prosperi, *Lo spazio della Chiesa tridentina. Qualche domanda*, in Giuseppe Papagno and Amedeo Quondam (eds.), *La corte e lo spazio. Ferrara estense*, 3 vols., Bulzoni, Rome 1982, pp. 83-92, especially p. 86; see also Id., *Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche e le idee religiose*, in *Il Rinascimento nelle corti padane*, cited above, pp. 125-63.

105. BAV, Vat. lat., 6406, f. 141r.

106. *Constitutiones novissimae*, cited above, p. 4v.

107. In 1568 the *Constitutiones additae synodo mutinensi*, cited above, pp. 3v-4r, complained that even in the cathedral the altars and chapels were not maintained "with the cleanliness that is fitting" and established new rules for their care.

108. Ibid., pp. 4rv, 8r.

109. G. Russo, *Il primo sinodo modenese*, cited above, pp. 120-24.

110. M. Al Kalak, *La città di tutte l'heresie*, cited above, pp. 111-12.

111. Modena, ACV, *Lettere di vescovi*, I.

112. S. Peyronel Rambaldi, *Speranze e crisi*, cited above, pp. 141-47.

113. Ibid., pp. 147-61; see above, section III.5.

114. See above, section IV.1.

115. C. Bianco, La comunità di "fratelli," cited above; M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, pp. 3 ff.

116. Several letters from Morone to Ercole Rangoni from 1563 to 1573 are in MoAS, *Carteggio principi esteri. Roma*, 1397/139. In one of them, replying on 26 February 1569 to a request concerning an ecclesiastical benefice claimed by Rangoni's son Venceslao, the cardinal explained that laymen could not hold any benefice and that he would therefore do well to renounce it, "because Church property held unlawfully often causes the ruin of other worldly goods and damns the soul."

117. In a letter sent to him from Reggio on 8 July 1572, Fulvio Rangoni alluded to Morone's long-standing association with his family and announced the portrait to him, saying that he was "desirous that the memory of my father the count's service to Your Most Illustrious Lordship should pass not only to me but to my children, who may always be favored and protected by your shadow," and asking him to serve as godfather to a newborn daughter (BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 112r).

118. Ibid., 6408, f. 149r, letter of 7 January 1567.

119. Ibid., f. 170r, letter of 5 March 1567. On attempts to establish a poorhouse in sixteenth-century Bologna, see Fabio Giusberti, *Poveri bolognesi, poveri forestieri e poveri inventati: un progetto di "rinchiudimento" nel XVIII secolo*, in Storia urbana, no. 13 (1980), pp. 31-54.

120. MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. IV, f. 31r, letter of 14 July 1565.

121. Ibid., f. 43rv, letter of 10 March 1568.

122. A. Mercati, *Il sommario del processo di Giordano Bruno*, cited above, p. 139.

123. See above, section III.5.

124. MoBE, ms Ital., 844 (α.H.1.13), ff. 36r-37r.

125. See Domenico da Imola's letter to Morone of 15 October 1567: "We have not failed to carry out executions: yesterday I had two Modenese men imprisoned, […] one named Giovanni Padovano, a shoemaker, had already been denounced by those who were burned five months ago, and one Geminiano Tamborino has been accused by Cervia [Pietro Antonio da Cervia]; however, there were other indications against him" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, ff. 200r-201v).

126. M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, pp. 13 ff.

127. A. Mercati, *Il sommario del processo di Giordano Bruno*, cited above, pp. 140 ff.

128. E. Brambilla, *Alle origini del Sant'Uffizio*, cited above, pp. 381-87, 543 ff.

129. S. Pagano, *Il processo di Endimio Calandra*, cited above

130. BAV, Urb. lat., 1040, f. 554r.

131. A copy of the document is in MoBE, ms Ital., 844 (α.H.1.13), ff. 51r-53r.

132. M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, p. 83.

133. MoAS, *Carteggio principi esteri. Roma*, 1397/139.

134. PM, vol. II, pp. 825 ff.

135. L. Castelvetro, *Filologia ed eresia*, cited above, p. 295. On the Modenese philologist's work, see G. Mongini, Il "Racconto delle vite d'alcuni letterati del suo tempo," cited above, pp. 285-313.

136. See the letter the Este duke sent him on 28 November 1571: "I have seen what Your Most Illustrious Lordship has written to me […] concerning the bishopric of Modena, and although in every respect I would more gladly see you than anyone else in that charge, nevertheless, having understood the reasons that have moved you […] and that are accompanied by your great prudence, I cannot but praise the decision you have made" (MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. VI, f. 29r); see also his letters to the cathedral chapter of 4 June and 17 November 1571, together with the replies of 17 July and 23 November (MoAC, Capitolo, 109).

137. G. van Gulik and C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, cited above, vol. III, p. 252, notes 5 and 6.

138. M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, p. 64.

139. BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 232r, letter to Morone of 21 April stating, among other things, that "Father Fra Nicolò dal Finale, vice-inquisitor of Ferrara, has indeed done what he promised Your Most Illustrious Lordship by giving a detailed account of the trials conducted in matters of religion, with which Our Lord and this Holy Office remain greatly satisfied, infinitely praising Your Most Illustrious Lordship's invention and skill, from whom nothing else, or nothing less, could have been expected."

140. M. Al Kalak, *L'eresia dei fratelli*, cited above, pp. 64-65.

141. The letter of 31 March 1568 in which the cardinal-nephew rebuffed his request for information about a Benedictine monk - Morone being protector of that order - had been no more than a small warning sign. He reminded Morone that the matter lay within the competence of the supreme inquisitors, "and it must be dealt with through them" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 224r).

142. See above, section VIII.4.

XXIII. "To Govern Well and Holily." Curial Offices

1. As Hubert Jedin already noted, *Per una preistoria della riforma dei regolari (Tridentino* sess. XXV a), in Id., *Chiesa della fede, Chiesa della storia*, cited above, pp. 227-94, especially p. 269, most of the documentation in the Vatican archives concerning the protectorates held by Morone dates from after the Council of Trent.

2. On these matters we can do no more than mention a few general surveys (*Dove va la storiografia monastica in Europa? Temi e metodi di ricerca per lo studio della vita monastica e regolare in età medievale alle soglie del terzo millennio*, proceedings of the conference, Brescia-Rodengo, 23-25 March 2000, edited by Giancarlo Andenna, Vita e Pensiero, Milan 2001) and syntheses (Roberto Rusconi, *Gli ordini religiosi maschili dalla Controriforma alle soppressioni settecentesche. Cultura, predicazione, missioni*, in *Clero e società nell'Italia moderna*, cited above, pp. 207-74; Paola Vismara, Il cattolicesimo dalla "riforma cattolica" all'assolutismo illuminato, in Giovanni Filoramo and Daniele Menozzi (eds.), *Storia del cristianesimo*, vol. III, *L'età moderna*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 1997, pp. 151-290; Massimo Carlo Giannini (ed.), *Religione, conflittualità e cultura. Il clero regolare nell'Europa d'antico regime*, in Cheiron, XXII [2005], nos. 43-44; Ottavia Niccoli, *La vita religiosa nell'Italia moderna. Secoli XV-XVIII*, Carocci, Rome 1998; Flavio Rurale, *Monaci, frati, chierici. Gli ordini religiosi in età moderna*, Carocci, Rome 2008).

3. Among the bibliography of recent decades, alongside Josef Wodka's classic study Zur *Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate der Kardinäle an der römischen Kurie*, Publikationen des Österreichischen historischen Instituts in Rom, Innsbruck-Leipzig 1938, see Olivier Poncet, *The Cardinal-Protectors of the Crowns in the Roman Curia during the First Half of the Seventeenth Century: the Case of France*, in G. Signorotto and M. A. Visceglia (eds.), *Courts and Politics in Papal Rome*, cited above, pp. 158-76; Péter Tusor, *Prolegomena zur Frage des Kronkardinalats*, in Archivum historiae pontificiae, XLI (2003), pp. 51-71; Martin Faber, *Scipione Borghese als Kardinalprotektor: Studien zur römischen*

Mikropolitik in der frühen Neuzeit, Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2005; Id., *Entweder Nepot oder Protektor. Scipione Borghese als Kardinalprotektor von Deutschland (1611-1633)*, in Richard Bösel, Grete Klingenstein, and Alexander Koller (eds.), *Kaiserhof - Papsthof (16.-18. Jahrhundert)*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2006, pp. 59-65; Birgit Emich, *Protektion und Patronage. Kardinalprotektorate im Kirchenstaat der Frühen Neuzeit*, in Tilman Haug, Nadir Weber, and Christian Windler (eds.), *Protegierte und Protektoren. Asymmetrische politische Beziehungen zwischen Partnerschaft und Dominanz (16. bis frühes 20. Jahrhundert)*, Böhlau, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna 2016, pp. 243-59.

4. Massimo Carlo Giannini, *Politica curiale e mondo dei regolari: per una storia dei cardinali protettori nel Seicento*, in Id. (ed.), *Religione, conflittualità e cultura*, cited above, pp. 241-302, see p. 243; Cristina Andenna, *Il cardinale protettore. Centro subalterno del potere papale e intermediario della comunicazione con gli ordini religiosi*, in Cristina Andenna, Gordon Blennemann, Klaus Herbers, and Gert Melville (eds.), *Die Ordnung der Kommunikation und die Kommunikation der Ordnungen*, vol. II, *Zentralität: Papsttum und Orden im Europa des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*, Franz Steiner, Stuttgart 2013, pp. 229-60.
5. F. RURALE, *Monaci, frati, chierici*, cited above, p. 49.
6. B. EMICH, *Protektion und Patronage*, cited above, p. 243.
7. On the figure of the vice-protector, see what Morone himself wrote to Philip II on 28 June 1575 (SAG, Estado, 923, no. 231).
8. M. C. Giannini, *Politica curiale e mondo dei regolari*, cited above; Alejandro Mario Dieguez, "Gubernator, protector et corrector": il processo di nomina del cardinal protettore, in François Jankowiak and Laura Pettinaroli (eds.), *Les cardinaux entre cour et curie. Une élite romaine (1775-2015)*, École française de Rome, Rome 2017, pp. 111-23. It was the 1917 Code of Canon Law that finally stripped the protectorates of all jurisdictional power.
9. A. M. DIEGUEZ, *«Gubernator, protector et corrector»*, cited above
10. Rosa Tamponi, *Il «De cardinalis dignitate et officio» del milanese Girolamo Piatti e la trattatistica cinque-seicentesca sul cardinale*, in «Annali di storia moderna e contemporanea», II (1996), pp. 79-129.
11. Bernardino da Siena, *Il cardinale protettore negli Istituti religiosi, specialmente negli ordini francescani*, Industria tipografica fiorentina, Firenze 1940, pp. 104-6.
12. This is the view of O. Poncet, *The Cardinal-Protectors of the Crowns*, cited above, pp. 161-62, based in part on contemporary treatises, including Giovan Battista De Luca, *Il cardinale della santa romana Chiesa pratico*, nella stamperia della reverenda Camera apostolica, Rome 1680, pp. 168-69.
13. From 1555 Morone was also protector of the Roman confraternity of San Girolamo della Carità (Elisabetta Marchetti, *Nuove ricerche sull'arciconfraternita di San Girolamo della Carità*, in Quaderni di scienza della conservazione, IV [2004], pp. 239-58, especially p. 245).
14. Paul V. Murphy, *The Jesuits and the Santa Casa di Loreto: Orazio Torsellini's* Lauretanae historiae libri quinque, in Thomas M. Lucas (ed.), *Spirit, Style, Story. Essays Honoring John W. Padberg, S.J.*, Loyola Press, Chicago 2002, pp. 269-81; Id., "Your Indies": the Jesuit Mission at the Santa Casa di Loreto in the Sixteenth Century, in Konrad Eisenbichler and Nicholas Terpstra (eds.), *The Renaissance in the Streets, Schools, and Studies. Essays in Honour of Paul F. Grendler*, Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Toronto 2008, pp. 211-32; Adriano Prosperi, *Lotto e la crisi religiosa italiana del '500*, now in Id., *Eresie e devozioni*, cited above, pp. 191-200.
15. Pier Paolo Vergerio, *De idolo Lauretano*, s. l. [ma Tübingen 1554], p. Biiir.
16. During his trial Morone defended himself against accusations of contempt for the cult of the saints by recalling a pilgrimage to Loreto in the early 1540s, when he carried with him "a silver votive offering made because of an illness of one of my brothers" (PM, vol. I, p. 459).

17. Massimo Firpo, *Artisti, gioiellieri, eretici. Il mondo di Lorenzo Lotto tra Riforma e* Controriforma, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2001, pp. 296 ff.
18. P. V. Murphy, *«Your Indies»*, cited above
19. See the fundamental studies by Francesca Coltrinari, *Loreto cantiere artistico internazionale nell'età della Controriforma. I committenti, gli artisti, il contesto*, Edifir, Florence 2016, p. 193, and *Artisti e committenti a Loreto (1538-1590). Nuovi documenti*, Edifir, Florence 2016, p. 905.
20. Ibid., pp. 909-10; but see pp. 907 ff., 912-13.
21. Matteo Sanfilippo, *Della Rovere, Giulio Feltrio*, in DBI, XXXVII, pp. 356-57.
22. Within Della Rovere's *entourage* there was concern that the incumbent legate did not truly intend to undertake the journey: see Claudio Gonzaga's letter from Rome of 6 September 1564 to Cardinal Della Rovere, published in F. Coltrinari, *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, p. 926.
23. id., *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, pp. 193-99.
24. Id., *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, pp. 911-12; for what follows, see the following pages.
25. PM, vol. II, p. 12, and above, section XX.4.
26. Archivio storico della Fabbrica di San Pietro, Arm. 53, C. 138, f. 91r; ibid., C. 146, f. 131r; see also BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, ff. 32r-33r, 75r.
27. F. Coltrinari, *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, pp. 102 ff.; Id., *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, pp. 929-30.
28. M. Firpo, *Artisti, gioiellieri, eretici*, cited above, pp. 300 ff.
29. For what follows, see also F. Coltrinari, *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, pp. 54 ff.
30. Renata Segre, *Nuovi documenti sui marrani d'Ancona (1555-1559)*, in Michael, IX (1985), pp. 130-233, see p. 144.
31. F. Coltrinari, *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, pp. 58 ff.
32. Id., *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, pp. 933-35. After Della Rovere took office, Morone continued to concern himself with relations between Jews and Christians in the Marches (Id., *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, p. 256).
33. Id., *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, pp. 962-63, 976-77, Della Rovere's letter to Morone of 22 February 1565; Id., *Loreto cantiere artistico*, cited above, p. 147.
34. F. Coltrinari, *Artisti e committenti a Loreto*, cited above, p. 1827.
35. Ibid., p. 1837. His caution irritated Morone on more than one occasion, as appears, for example, from a letter written to him on 4 September 1579 (ibid., p. 1843).
36. Nicola Raponi, *Galeazzo Morone: un prelato milanese dell'età borromaica, vescovo di Macerata e Recanati (1573-1586)*, in Annali della facoltà di Lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Macerata, XXII-XXIII (1989-90), vol. I, pp. 75-105.
37. A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 209.
38. MiAGS, XLI. E. 4 (3).
39. M. C. Giannini, *Politica curiale e mondo dei regolari*, cited above, p. 245.
40. O. Niccoli, *Rinascimento anticlericale*, cited above; see E. Bonora, La Controriforma, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2001, pp. 68-69.
41. H. Jedin, *Per una preistoria della riforma dei regolari*, cited above, pp. 264-65.
42. F. Rurale emphasizes these aspects in *Monaci, frati, chierici*, cited above, pp. 61 ff.
43. P. Vismara, *Il cattolicesimo dalla «riforma cattolica»*, cited above, pp. 162-65.

44. O. Niccoli, *La vita religiosa nell'Italia moderna*, cited above, p. 69.

45. F. Rurale, *Monaci, frati, chierici*, cited above, pp. 47-49, 137 ff.

46. Ibid., p. 138.

47. Ibid., p. 130.

48. H. Jedin, *Per una preistoria della riforma dei regolari*, cited above, p. 235, who nevertheless notes, with reference to Morone, the documentary gaps indicated in note 85.

49. See above, section XIII.2.

50. The bibliography on the Friars Preachers in the sixteenth century is sparse and fragmented: A. Walz, I *domenicani al concilio di Trento*, cited above; Massimo Carlo Giannini, *I domenicani*, il Mulino, Bologna 2016, especially pp. 128-43; Gabriella Zarri, *Dallo scisma all'apogeo della Chiesa: i domenicani tra i secoli XV e XVII*, in Gianni Festa and Marco Rainini (eds.), *L'Ordine dei predicatori. I domenicani: storia, figure e istituzioni (1216-2016)*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2016, pp. 30-57.

51. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 16r.

52. Ibid., ff. 6rv, 12r-13v, 18r, 33r-64r, 112r-113v.

53. Miguel Gotor, *I beati del papa. Santità, Inquisizione e obbedienza in età moderna*, Olschki, Firenze 2002, p. 13.

54. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 85rv.

55. Ibid., ff. 66r-74v, 15 October 1579, ff. 66v, 67r, 68v, 71v.

56. Ibid., ff. 100r-104v, especially f. 100r.

57. Ibid., f. 28r.

58. See the documents preserved in ASV, Arm. LXIV, 34, f. 122rv; ibid., Conc. trid., 2, ff. 81r-82v; Carlo d'Arco, *Studi intorno al municipio di Mantova*, vol. VII, Viviano Guastalla, Mantua 1874, p. 100; CT, vol. VIII, pp. 155-57.

59. Renato Lefevre, *Roma e la comunità etiopica di Cipro nei secoli XV e XVI*, in Rassegna di studi etiopici, I (1941), pp. 71-86. Morone's appointment had been urged by the Bishop of Urbino, Felice Tiranni, Pius IV's majordomo, and by the prior and chaplain of the church itself, Giovan Battista known as the Abyssinian, likewise a member of Pope Medici's household (R. De Maio, *Riforme e miti*, cited above, p. 118).

60. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 87r, letter of 4 December 1565.

61. Ibid., f. 92r; the sender's name and the date 14 March 1566 are difficult to read.

62. M. C. Giannini, *I domenicani*, cited above, p. 133.

63. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 94r, letter of 6 [?] July 1570; see Dario Busolini, Giustiniani, Vincenzo, in DBI, vol. LVII, pp. 364-66.

64. ASV, Conc. trid., f. 28r, letter "of May 1564."

65. See above, section XIX.2.

66. Raffaella Zaccaria, Ercolani, Vincenzo, in DBI, vol. XLIII, pp. 92-95. As we shall see, the Perugian nobleman played an important role in the reform of several Cistercian abbeys, another order under Morone's protection.

67. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 238r.

68. As late as 1571 Cardinal Guido Ferrero of Vercelli, then engaged in reorganizing his diocesan clergy according to the Tridentine decrees, asked Morone to entrust him with the task "of visiting those fathers" of Saint Jerome and curbing their "excesses." He reported that "they lead bad lives, some own private property, and, worst of all, they lend money at interest, as is customary in that place, to the great scandal of those who know of it," and that this brought "little credit to that religious order" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 42r, letter of 25 March 1571). On Ferrero's work in his diocese, see Donatella Rosselli, Ferrero, Guido, in DBI, vol. XLVII, pp. 27-29.

69. Marco Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati." Chiaravalle milanese e la riforma della congregazione cistercense di san Bernardo in Italia (tra XVI e XVII secolo)*, in Paolo Tomea (ed.), *Chiaravalle. Arte e storia di un'abbazia cistercense*, Electa, Milan 1992, pp. 139-77, especially p. 150 and note 80.

70. Bertrand Marceau, *Le pape, le roi et l'abbé. Défendre à Rome l'autonomie de l'ordre ecclésiastique au début du règne de Henri III (1574-1575)*, in *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, CXXIII (2011), pp. 195-219, see p. 210. Even after Morone's death, in 1584, he would complain that Morone, "being Spanish in sympathy, wished to impose this burden [removing the Cistercian nuns from the order's jurisdiction] because he himself was French" (M. Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati,"* cited above, p. 174, note 87).

71. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 136rv, undated *Informatione*.

72. Ibid., ff. 338r-339v.

73. Morone nevertheless drew a firm line through the entire paragraph.

74. See his letter to Morone of 24 November 1564, praising his efforts "so that nothing may be dispatched to the prejudice of the election of Cîteaux, for which I could not fail to thank you as fully as I know how and can" (ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 240rv).

75. Ibid., f. 286r (n.d.).

76. NG, vol. I, p. 140; ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 264r.

77. Polykarp Zakar, *Generaläbte der Zisterzienser auf dem Konzil von Trient. Zur Vorgeschichte der Fürstenfelder Äbteversammlung von 1595*, in *Analecta Cisterciensia*, LII (1996), pp. 49-175, especially pp. 64-70.

78. Boucherat's secretary and successor, Edmond de la Croix, would be sent to Poland as visitor in 1580 (Alois Postina, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Cistercienserklöster des 16. Jahrhunderts in Italien*, in *Cistercienser Chronik*, XIII (1901), pp. 193-205, 225-37, 257-66).

79. Anna Maria Affanni, *La basilica di Santa Croce di Gerusalemme a Roma: quando l'antico è futuro*, Betagamma, Rome 1997, p. 47.

80. M. Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati,"* cited above, p. 153.

81. F. Rurale, *Monaci, frati, chierici*, cited above.

82. M. Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati,"* cited above, pp. 153-62. The general chapter held in Rome in 1580 approved the *Ordinationes et statuta congregationis sancti Bernardi in Italia*, which were definitively approved by Sixtus V in 1585 and published in Milan in 1589.

83. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, ff. 140r-142v, letter of 15 July 1578.

84. Ibid., ff. 116r-122v.

85. M. Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati,"* cited above, p. 153.

86. On 3 June 1564, writing from Alessandria, Baissey told Morone that, "although not all follow the same line of the holy rule equally, nevertheless, considering the character of our age and the other religious orders, [our monks] live in good order and conduct themselves religiously. [...] Nor have I failed to stamp out everything dissolute and corrupt that I found and to bring transgressors back to the best monastic discipline, so that now, as I go to France, I carry with me the greatest consolation regarding this congregation" (ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 132rv). Baissey died on 19 June at the convent of Pogliola in Piedmont.

87. R. Zaccaria, Ercolani, Vincenzo, cited above. On 11 August 1566 Francesco I de' Medici urged Morone to care for the order and protect those "fathers devoted and attached to him" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 65r).

88. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, ff. 274r-277v, anonymous *Informatione* of 5 November 1570.

89. A. Prosperi, *L'eresia del Libro Grande*, cited above, pp. 255 ff.; Barry Collett, *Italian Benedictine Scholars and the Reformation. The Congregation of Santa Giustina of Padua*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1985, pp. 246 ff.

90. M. Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 466-76.

91. Lucio Biasiori, Rioli, Giorgio, in DBI, vol. LXXXVII, pp. 634-38.

92. A. Prosperi, *L'eresia del Libro Grande*, cited above, pp. 256-57; M. Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia*, cited above, vol. II, p. 571.

93. ASV, Conc. trid., 23, ff. 28r, 46r-51v, 54r-77v, 83r-85r, 86r-87v, 101r-109r and subsequent unnumbered folios.

94. Ibid., f. 20r.

95. Ibid., ff. 178r-179r; see ff. 180r-209v, the long attached memorial.

96. Ibid., ff. 246r-247v, letter of 31 October 1569.

97. Ibid., ff. 42r-45v (n.d.).

98. See, for example, the draft of a letter from Morone to Borromeo of 3 December 1578, showing that the archbishop of Milan had sent him papers concerning the "accusations" against several Cistercian monks (ibid., 2, f. 346r).

99. Ibid., 23, ff. 14r-21v (n.d.).

100. Aldo Stella, *Chiesa e Stato nelle relazioni dei nunzi pontifici a Venezia. Ricerche sul giurisdizionalismo veneziano dal XVI al XVIII*, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, Vatican City 1964, p. 189.

101. The phrase is F. Rurale's, *Monaci, frati, chierici*, cited above, p. 105.

102. E. Bonora, *La Controriforma*, cited above, p. 71.

103. M. Bascapè, *La "perpetuità delli abbati,"* cited above, pp. 154-55. Don Teofilo had to report that during the "very great wars of past years" German landsknechts had plundered the libraries of Lombard monasteries.

104. ASV, Conc. trid., 23, f. 258r, letter of 23 April 1562 from the president and the "definitors" of the congregation.

105. M. Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 605-6.

106. Ibid., pp. 612-13.

107. In a letter from Caprarola dated 31 August 1566, for example, Cardinal Farnese recommended to Morone that he "take under [his] protection" the Greek scholar Matteo Devaris, holder of a pension "recently confirmed by Pius IV, with the duty of expanding and correcting Greek books continually used by the copyists of the Vatican Library for its preservation and enlargement" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 69r). Devaris was working on the translation of the Tridentine decrees and the catechism, as well as revising the decrees of the Council of Florence, then being published in Greek for the first time (Massimo Ceresa, Devaris, Matteo, in DBI, vol. XXXIX, pp. 513-16).

108. On 5 December 1565, for example, an "Isidoro of Florence, a Cassinese monk," wrote to Morone from Modena concerning certain "doubtful matters" that unnamed "revisers" had found in his translation of a Greek text (ASV, Conc. trid., 23, f. 316rv).

109. BAV, Vat. lat., 6409, f. 289r. The restoration of episcopal authority and of the residence obligation according to the model of the primitive Church had already been central to Bovio's studies (Adriano Prosperi, Bovio, Giovanni Carlo, in DBI, vol. XIII, pp. 559-60).

110. M. Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia*, cited above, vol. II, p. 575; E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 59.

111. See above, section III.3.

112. M. Zaggia, *Tra Mantova e la Sicilia*, cited above, vol. II, p. 493.

113. Stefan Bauer, Panvinio, Onofrio, in DBI, vol. LXXXI, pp. 36-39.

114. BAV, Vat. lat., 6404, f. 161r, letter of 20 July 1566, in which Morone wrote that he would send the first volume of the manuscript *Historia* to Madrid "so that His Majesty may see it," while six further volumes remained, although the Spanish ambassador had already seen them. This may be the manuscript dedicated to the sovereign now in the Royal Library of El Escorial (ms f.I.16).

115. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 540-41.

116. See the entry Umiliati in the *Enciclopedia ecclesiastica*, edited by Pietro Pianton, 8 vols., Stabilimento di Girolamo Tasso, Venice 1854-64, vol. VII, p. 578. Morone's protectorate has left very few documentary traces. We know that the outgoing protector continued to consult with Borromeo and take an interest in the order's fate (see M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, p. 205, and the documentation in ASV, Conc. trid., 23, ff. 338r-341v, 342r-347v, 355r-362r, 366r-367v).

117. V. Panighetti, *L'ordine degli Umiliati*, cited above, pp. 71 ff.; see pp. 79-83, two reports sent to Morone by the provost general Girolamo Torchio, who died in 1552. On the Humiliati, with fuller bibliography, see M. P. Alberzoni, A. Ambrosioni, and A. Lucioni (eds.), *Sulle tracce degli Umiliati*, cited above; A. Ambrosioni, Umiliate/Umiliati, cited above, vol. VI, cols. 1489-1507; Id., *Gli Umiliati*, cited above, pp. 113-28. Morone's protectorate over the male and female Humiliati has left very few documentary traces. We know that the outgoing protector continued to consult with Borromeo and take an interest in their fate, as stated by M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, p. 205, and shown by the documentation in ASV, Conc. trid., 23, ff. 338r-341v, 342r-347v (a list of monasteries), 355r-362r, 366r-367v, an undated letter reporting, among other things, that of the thirty-four Milanese friars, ten "are in Brera without morals and ignorant, and for this reason the divine offices cannot be celebrated with attention and devotion; and [...] lacking suitable dress, they go about the city to no small scandal of the laity." On 7 June 1570, shortly before the order's suppression, Borromeo wrote from the Charterhouse of Garegnano (ibid., ff. 368r-369v), outlining to Morone the prospect of establishing a seminary of "about one hundred or two hundred boys," which could be organized with the same care

already devoted "to my secular clerics, and I would strive to govern it with the charity to which I am bound as protector of this order." A reference to a benefice dispute in which Morone intervened in favor of the friars appears in a letter of 7 September 1555 from the nuncio in Venice, Filippo Archinto, to Carlo Carafa (Daniele Santarelli, *La nunziatura di Venezia sotto il papato di Paolo IV. La corrispondenza di Filippo Archinto e Antonio Trivulzio (1555-1557)*, Aracne, Rome 2010, p. 47). When the order was suppressed in February 1571, Morone was not among the cardinals who benefited from its abbeys and provostships (BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 27r).

118. PM, vol. II, pp. 1595-96.

119. Ibid., p. 786; see pp. 773-74, 794, 810, 873, 939; on the Charity, see Pastor, vol. IV/2, pp. 111-12, 649; Massimo Marcocchi, *La Riforma cattolica. Documenti e testimonianze*, 2 vols., Morcelliana, Brescia 1967, vol. I, pp. 228-29; P. Paschini, *Tre ricerche*, cited above, pp. 51-52. BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 27r.

120. PM, vol. II, p. 151.

121. Andrea Carlino, *L'arciconfraternita di San Girolamo della Carità: l'origine e l'ideologia assistenziale*, in *Archivio della Società romana di storia patria*, CVII (1984), pp. 275-306, see p. 297; on the confraternity, see also Daniela Solfaroli Camillocci, *I devoti della carità. Le confraternite del Divino Amore nell'Italia del primo Cinquecento*, La Città del Sole, Naples 2002, pp. 157 ff.

122. PM, vol. II, pp. 117, 773.

123. MiAGS, XLI. B. 1; ASMo, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Giovanni Morone, 264/7; see M. Firpo and G. Maifreda, *Vivere (e morire) da cardinale*, cited above, p. 36.

124. PM, vol. II, p. 926; see p. 773.

125. B. Emich, *Protektion und Patronage*, cited above, pp. 249-51.

126. O. Poncet, *The Cardinal-Protectors of the Crowns*, cited above, p. 161.

127. Ibid., p. 162; J. Wodka, *Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate*, cited above, p. 2.

128. Ibid.

129. NB3, vol. VI, p. 47.

130. William E. Wilkie, *The Cardinal Protectors of England. Rome and the Tudors before the Reformation*, Cambridge University Press, New York-London 1974, p. 238. As already noted, from 1560 Morone also protected the nation known as Ethiopian or Abyssinian, attached to the church of Santo Stefano in the Vatican (J. Wodka, *Zur Geschichte der nationalen Protektorate*, cited above, pp. 118, 120, 124; R. Lefevre, *Roma e la comunità etiopica di Cipro*, cited above).

131. ASV, Arm. LXIV, 28, f. 104r, letter sent to an English aristocrat.

132. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 188. On the publication of Pole's *De concilio* and *reformatio Angliae* in 1562, see above, section XIX.1.

133. ASV, Arm. LXIV, 28, ff. 152r-153v, 165rv; see ff. 166r-171v.

134. On the assumptions underlying this lack of attention, see Stefano Villani, *Britain and the Papacy: Diplomacy and Conflict in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century*, in Maria Antonietta Visceglia (ed.), *Papato e politica internazionale nella prima età moderna*, Viella, Rome 2013, pp. 301-22, see p. 303.

135. PM, vol. I, p. 514, note 40.

136. Stella Fletcher, *The Popes and Britain. A History of Rule, Rupture and Reconciliation*, Tauris, London-New York 2017, pp. 88-89; Peter Marshall, *Heretics and Believers. A History of the English Reformation*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London 2017, pp. 451-52.

137. ASV, Arm. LXIV, 28, ff. 175r-176r; see Charles Gerwien Bayne, *Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1913, pp. 285-87. Other "reports from England" received by Morone are in ASV, Arm. LXIV, 28, ff. 142r, 149r.

138. Giuseppe Motta, Martinengo, Girolamo, in DBI, vol. LXXI, pp. 154-57.

139. ASV, Arm. LXIV, 28, ff. 297r-298v (n.d., n.p., but Rome, March 1561), edited by Arnold Oskar Meyer, *England und die Katholische Kirche unter Elisabeth*, Loescher, Rome 1911, pp. 405-6; see pp. 407-8, the instruction given to Martinengo on 9 March 1561.

140. F. Rurale, *Pio IV*, cited above.

141. On Vergerio's pamphlet *Alla serenissima regina d'Inghilterra. Del concilio di Trento*, published in 1562, see Giorgio Caravale, *Preaching and Inquisition in Renaissance Italy. Words on Trial*, Brill, Leiden 2016, p. 169.

142. A. O. Meyer, *England und die Katholische Kirche*, cited above, p. 408, Morone's letter to Borromeo of 21 June 1563.

143. Ibid., p. 43.

144. Ibid., p. 409, Morone's letter to Borromeo of 28 June 1563. The episode is reconstructed by William P. Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation. The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion*, Cambridge University Press, London-New York 1968, pp. 305-6.

145. A. O. Meyer, *England und die Katholische Kirche*, cited above, pp. 410-11.

146. Ibid., pp. 412-14, letter of Thomas Harding and Nicholas Sanders to Morone of 11 June 1567.

147. Ibid., pp. 45-46; Edward Town, *A House 'Re-Edified.' Thomas Sackville and the Transformation of Knole 1605-1608*, DPhil thesis, University of Sussex, 2010, pp. 30-32.

148. Domenico Rocciolo, *Chiese nazionali e Chiesa locale a Roma in età moderna: aspetti giurisdizionali e interrelazioni*, in Antal Molnár, Giovanni Pizzorusso, and Matteo Sanfilippo (eds.), *Chiese e "nationes" a Roma: dalla Scandinavia ai Balcani. Secoli XV-XVIII*, Viella, Rome 2017, pp. 23-36, see p. 29.

149. Giovanni Pizzorusso and Matteo Sanfilippo, *Dalle frontiere dell'Europa cattolica alla Città Eterna: chiese nazionali e comunità straniere in età moderna*, ibid., pp. 225-42.

150. Among Morone's papers, for example, is a list of "Englishmen living in Rome outside the college" (*angli extra collegium Romae degentes*) who held positions in the city's ecclesiastical and civil institutions (BAV, Vat. lat., 12159, f. 129r).

151. Irene Fosi, *Convertire lo straniero. Forestieri e Inquisizione a Roma in età moderna*, Viella, Rome 2011, pp. 25-40.

152. Eamon Duffy, *Il cardinal Pole, il Papato e la fondazione del Venerabile*, in *La chiesa del collegio inglese a Roma. La storia, il restauro*, Gangemi, Rome 2009, pp. 16-33.

153. Thomas M. McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-1588. "Our Way of Proceeding?"*, Brill, Leiden-New York-Cologne 1996, pp. 32-33. This occurred while Pole, from November 1555 to February 1556, presided over the sole session of the London synod, interrupted when Paul IV revoked his legation in April 1556. Immediately after the session ended, Morone had been informed of the conclusions reached in London and, carrying out his colleague's wishes, read them to the pope (Giuseppe Rambaldi, *Ordinazioni anglicane e ecclesiologia. II*, in *Gregorianum*, LXXIV, 1993, no. 3, pp. 461-97, especially pp. 484-85).

154. Jason Nice, *Sacred History and National Identity. Comparisons between Early Modern Wales and Brittany*, Routledge, London-New York 2009, pp. 136-37.

155. Matteo Binasco, *Le comunità anglo-celtiche nella Roma del XVI e XVII secolo*, in A. Molnár, G. Pizzorusso, and M. Sanfilippo (eds.), *Chiese e "nationes" a Roma*, cited above, pp. 37-48, and Tobias Daniels, *La chiesa di Santa Maria dell'Anima tra Papato e Impero (secoli XV-XVII)*, ibid., pp. 77-95. The bull is reproduced in Mark Aloysius Tierney, *Dodd's Church History of England from the Commencement of the Sixteenth Century to the Revolution in 1688*, vol. II, Charles Dolman, London 1839, pp. 337-45: "We appoint our venerable brother John, bishop and cardinal, called Morone,

protector and defender of that college" (*Venerabilem fratrem nostrum, Iohannem, episcopum cardinalem, Moronum nuncupatum, eiusdem collegii protectorem et defensorem constituimus*); the reference to Morone's role in drafting the bull is on p. 170.

156. See above, section XIX.2.

157. BAV, Vat. lat., 12159, f. 153r (n.d.).

158. See, for example, ibid., ff. 52r-53r.

159. See ibid., f. 43r.

160. Ibid., ff. 41rv, 93r-94v.

161. Ibid., ff. 77r-84v, 86v.

162. See ibid., ff. 116rv, 173rv, Pole's regulations with Morone's approval of 6 June 1565.

163. Ibid., f. 133r. Students had to sign the rules when entering the college, promising Morone that they would always obey the papal will (ibid., f. 147rv, the certificate for the year 1579).

164. Ibid., f. 107r.

165. The hospital's annual operation was budgeted at about 900 scudi, approximately 500 of which went to staff and 20 to medicines (ibid., f. 151r).

166. Ibid., f. 145r.

167. BAV, Vat. lat., 12159, ff. 113rv, 123r. Some of the teachers named appear as signatories to a declaration addressed to Pius IV in January 1564, certifying that Richard and Thomas Sackville were indeed of royal blood (Catholic Record Society, *Miscellanea*, vol. II, Catholic Record Society, London 1905-64, Arden Press, London 1906, pp. 3-4).

168. BAV, Vat. lat., 12159, ff. 135r-140v.

169. Luigi Gaetano Marini, *Degli archiatri pontifici*, vol. I, Stamperia Pagliarini, Rome 1784, p. 475; see Craig Martin, *Subverting Aristotle. Religion, History, and Philosophy in Early Modern Science*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 2014, p. 116.

170. BAV, Vat. lat., 12159, f. 169r (n.d.).

171. Ibid., ff. 180r-186v, report of the visitation of 24 June 1576.

172. Ibid., f. 210rv (n.d.).

173. Ibid., f. 181r.

XXIV. Among the "Most Important Advisers on Matters of State": Giovanni Morone and Multiconfessional Europe

1. Pastor, vol. IX, pp. 876-77; see p. 875.

2. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 101, letter of Don Luis de Requesens of 23 January 1566.

3. See, for example, limiting ourselves to Spain, the documents published ibid., pp. 40, 65, 82; vol. II, pp. 275, 399, 407; vol. III, pp. 25, 225-26, where Morone is repeatedly described as Philip II's "servant" (*servidor*).

4. E. Bonora, *Giudicare i vescovi*, cited above, p. 224.

5. See, for example, the letter of thanks sent by the sovereign to Morone on 22 January 1572 for his congratulations on the birth of Prince Ferdinand (BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 94r); the same form of address from the Spanish sovereign appears in other letters of 22 July 1572, 21 June 1574, and 30 June 1576 (ibid., ff. 120r, 206r, 249r).

6. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. II, p. 483.

7. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 185.

8. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. III, p. 151, letter of 28 September 1569.

9. Ibid., vol. II, p. 483, letter of 12 October 1568; see vol. III, pp. 25, 49-50, 151; vol. IV, pp. 712, 719.

10. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *Morte e elezione del papa. Norme, riti e conflitti. L'età moderna*, Viella, Rome 2013, p. 281.

11. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 84, fasc. 377, ciphered letter from Evangelista Baroni to the duke of Ferrara of 13 May 1572.

12. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 196, Zúñiga's letter of 21 February 1571.

13. BAV, Urb. lat., 1041, f. 258r.

14. See below, section XXIV.2.

15. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 154. On 17 September 1574, emphasizing that Morone had greatly assisted him in protecting Spanish interests at the curia, Zúñiga forwarded to Philip II Morone's request for a pension for his nephew Girolamo Gallarati and a privilege for his brother Sforza, a senator of Milan since 1556, also urging Sforza's appointment as commissary general of the army in Lombardy, which he later obtained (M. C. Giannini, *Per difesa comune*, cited above, pp. 422-23, note 207); Morone's letter of thanks is in SAG, Estado, 926, no. 41; see also no. 65.

16. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 155-56.

17. Ibid., p. 336, note 1, letter of 22 May 1571.

18. Ibid., pp. 712, 719, Zúñiga's letters of 29 and 30 March 1572.

19. *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España*, vol. CII, Rafael Marco y Viñas, Madrid 1892, pp. 124-25, letter of 13 May 1573.

20. SAG, Estado, 919, no. 17; see nos. 5-8.

21. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 871; see SAG, Estado, 931, no. 219, Zúñiga's letter of 1 December 1578.

22. See below, sections XXV.1 and XXVI.1.

23. Alain Tallon, *Conflicts et médiations dans la politique internationale de la papauté*, in M. A. Visceglia (ed.), *Papato e politica internazionale*, cited above, pp. 117-29, which identifies Morone's Genoese mission as an example of the "choice of active neutrality and mediation [...] dictated by the properly Italian interests of the Papal State" (p. 119).

24. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 269; see p. 267.

25. Ibid., p. 252.

26. SAG, Estado, 931, no. 94, letter of 4 September 1578.

27. Ibid., no. 106.

28. Ibid., 932, three unnumbered documents.

29. Ibid., 934, no. 196, Morone's letter of 2 June 1579.

30. See the important study by E. Bonora, *"Come s'egli non fusse al mondo,"* cited above.

31. For a general overview, Italian readers may now consult Lucia Felici, *La Riforma protestante nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, Carocci, Rome 2016, pp. 195 ff.; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Riforma. La divisione della casa comune europea (1490-1700)*, foreword by Adriano Prosperi, Carocci, Rome 2017; Mark Greengrass, *La cristianità in frantumi. Europa 1517-1648*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2017.

32. L. Felici, *La Riforma protestante*, cited above, pp. 239-40.

33. Hubert Jedin, *Il papato e l'attuazione del Tridentino (1565-1605)*, in *Storia della Chiesa*, edited by Jedin, vol. VI, Jaca Book, Milan 1975, pp. 599-789.

34. The debate over the genuinely "religious" nature of several wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially the Thirty Years' War, together with an analysis of why recent historiography has underestimated that dimension, is reconstructed by Cornel Zwierlein, *The Thirty Years' War - A Religious War? Religion and Machiavellism at the Turning Point of 1635*, in Olaf Asbach and Peter Schröder (eds.), *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Thirty Years' War*, Ashgate, Farnham-Burlington, VT, 2014, pp. 231-43.

35. See his letter from Vienna of 23 January 1567, in which he recalled the many "obligations that I have toward Your Most Illustrious Lordship, and that my poor house has toward your illustrious house" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, ff. 159r-162v). On Biglia, see Gerhard Rill, Biglia, Melchiorre, in DBI, vol. X, pp. 418-19.

36. BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, ff. 280r-282v, letter of 23 September 1568.

37. Ibid., f. 281r.

38. For what follows, see also L. Felici, *La Riforma protestante*, cited above, pp. 202 ff.

39. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 446. In this case too, as after his departure on the imperial legation in January 1566, Commendone sought Morone's support and asked for his "reminders and advice" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6408, f. 285r, letter of 24 September 1568). Commendone's embarrassment toward his colleague is already evident in the letter he sent him from Trent on 31 January 1566: "In this burden, far beyond my strength, imposed on me by Our Lord and the Sacred College, nothing consoles me more than the protection that Your Most Illustrious Lordship extends over public affairs and over me as well" (ibid., f. 18r).

40. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 479, also with reference to communications between Morone and Vincenzo dal Portico, nuncio to the Diet of Lublin, which decreed a union between the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania that was no longer merely personal.

41. Domenico Caccamo, Commendone, Giovanni Francesco, in DBI, vol. XXVII, pp. 608-11.

42. Simona Feci, Pio V, papa, santo, in DBI, vol. LXXXIII, pp. 814-25.

43. Fernand Braudel, *Civiltà e imperi del Mediterraneo nell'età di Filippo II*, Einaudi, Turin 1976, p. 1330.

44. Maria Antonietta Visceglia, *The International Policy of the Papacy. Critical Approaches to the Concepts of Universalism and "Italianità," Peace and War*, in M. A. Visceglia (ed.), *Papato e politica internazionale*, cited above, pp. 17-62, especially p. 39.

45. Silvano Giordano, *Uomini e apparati della politica internazionale del papato*, ibid., pp. 131-48.

46. Pastor, vol. VIII, pp. 514-15. By late December 1566, however, the Spanish ambassador was already writing to Philip II that the commission "went no further" (*no pasó adelante*) (*Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. I, p. 434).

47. S. Feci, Pio V, cited above. The imperial ambassador in Rome also protested at a meeting held on 5 March 1570 in the pope's private apartments, in Morone's presence (Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 455).

48. A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, pp. 210 ff.

49. SAG, Estado, 913, nos. 187-88; ibid., 914, nos. 94, 124-32, 135-36.

50. Ibid., 914, no. 23.

51. BAV, Urb. lat., 1042, f. 134v; see ff. 135v, 153v, 154v, 162v.

52. *Relazioni degli ambasciatori veneti*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 179.

53. Luciano Serrano, *La Liga de Lepanto entre España, Venecia y la Santa Sede (1570-1573)*, 2 vols., Junta para la ampliación de estudios e investigaciones científicas, Escuela española en Roma, Madrid 1918-19, vol. I, p. 192, note 8, letter of 2 June 1572. Various details about Morone's role in preparing the Holy League, despite his continual attacks of gout, appear in the letters of the Venetian ambassador of those months, Giovanni Soranzo, who described him as "a cardinal regarded above all others as wise and judicious, and very dependent on the emperor" (VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 8, f. 272r;

ibid., 7-8, passim). According to Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 533, the alliance was concluded chiefly through "the merit of Pius V, who never tired of calming and smoothing out [the disagreements between Spain and Venice], restraining his fiery nature with great force of will"; see also Maurizio Gattoni, *Pio V e la politica iberica dello Stato pontificio (1566-1572)*, Studium, Rome 2006, pp. 131 ff.

54. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 530.

55. Ibid., p. 534.

56. Sereno's manuscript, written after he became a Cassinese monk under the name Zaccaria, was not published until the nineteenth century: Bartolomeo Sereno, *Commentari della guerra di Cipro e della lega dei principi cristiani contro il Turco*, Tipi di Monte Cassino, Monte Cassino 1845, pp. 396-97. For some information on Sereno, see Carlantonio di Villarosa, or Carlo Antonio de Rosa, *Notizie di alcuni cavalieri del sacro ordine gerosolimitano illustri per lettere e per belle arti*, Stamperia e Cartiere del Fibreno, Naples 1841, p. 319.

57. Alberto Guglielmotti, *Marcantonio Colonna alla battaglia di Lepanto*, Le Monnier, Florence 1862, pp. 145-47.

58. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 536.

59. A. Barbero, *Lepanto*, cited above, p. 330.

60. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 12, letter of Philip II's commissioners of 10 December 1570, attesting that Morone spoke "on behalf of us all" (*en nombre de todos nos*).

61. Ibid., p. 133; see SAG, Estado, 914, no. 137, draft of a brief and curt reply from the Catholic king, dated Madrid, 5 February 1571.

62. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 134; see pp. 154-55, Juan de Zúñiga's letter to Philip II of 29 December 1570; see SAG, Estado, 914, nos. 152-53, 204-5, 263.

63. A copy of the treaty articles, signed by "the lord cardinals Morone, Chiesa, Aldobrandino, and Rusticucci," is ibid., 918, no. 117.

64. In Pastor's formulation, vol. VIII, p. 547.

65. *Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, pp. 154-55.

66. A first survey of this vast subject is provided by Eric Dursteler, *Commerce and Coexistence: Veneto-Ottoman Trade in the Early Modern Era*, in *Turcica*, no. 34 (2002), pp. 105-33; Daniel Goffman, *The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, pp. 131 ff.

67. Pastor, vol. VIII, p. 547; see the capitulations between the league's naval and land forces signed on 10 February 1572 in Morone's presence (*Correspondencia diplomática*, cited above, vol. IV, p. 659).

68. SAG, Estado, 917, no. 211.

69. Ibid., no. 82.

70. But see above, section XXI.1, note 87.

71. S. Feci, Pio V, cited above.

72. BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 64r, letter of 16 November 1571.

73. SAG, Estado, 917, no. 73.

74. Ibid., no. 43.

75. BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 78r, letter of 10 December 1571.

76. Giuliano Uguzzone's letter on Croatia, addressed to Morone on 17 November 1571, is ibid., f. 72r; see also f. 68r, and Malatesta's letter to Morone of 3 April 1571, in which he reported that he had been "appointed governor-general in Albania and part of Dalmatia" and was preparing to depart the following week with eight galleys, a galleon, and "more than 2,700 infantrymen," thanks to funds from the dukes

of Urbino and Mantua "and many other lords, my patrons and friends" (ibid., f. 44r). On him, see Vittorio Mandelli, Malatesta, Giacomo, in DBI, vol. LXVIII, pp. 52-53.

77. See the letters sent by Uguzzone to Morone from Venice between November 1571 and January 1572 (BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, ff. 62rv, 68r-69v, 82r-83v, 84r, 86r-87v).

78. SAG, Estado, 918, nos. 253, 260, 261.

79. L. Serrano, *La Liga de Lepanto*, cited above, vol. I, p. 193.

80. Ibid., p. 192, note 7.

81. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 84, fasc. 377, ciphered letter from Evangelista Baroni to the duke of Ferrara of 14 May 1572.

82. Agostino Borromeo, Gregorio XIII, papa, in DBI, vol. LIX, pp. 204-19.

83. L. Serrano, *La Liga de Lepanto*, cited above, p. 191, note 4, letter of 2 June 1572.

84. SAG, Estado, 920, nos. 114, 143.

85. Ibid., no. 177.

86. Ibid., 922, no. 16.

87. Zúñiga went on to assure the sovereign that he was doing everything possible to retain Morone's favor, while stressing that it would be very important for the king to write to him personally to thank him for what he had done and to show that he had complete confidence in him and Gallio (ibid., 919, no. 34).

88. Ibid., nos. 47-49.

89. Ibid., nos. 73, 92.

90. Ibid., 921, no. 119; see also his letter of 12 May: "Morone always places Your Majesty's interests before those of France, and I therefore make use of his assistance. It would be very useful for Your Majesty to write to him, showing that you rely on him" (ibid., 922, no. 176).

91. See his letters of 7 March and 7 April 1574 (ibid., 923, nos. 204, 206-9) and Philip II's note of 5 May, "Cardinal Morone should be written what Don Juan [de Zúñiga] says" (ibid., nos. 176-77), which became a letter enclosed with that addressed to Zúñiga on 10 May, expressing the king's gratitude for Morone's good offices and complete satisfaction with his conduct in everything concerning "my affairs and service" (*mis cosas y servicio*) (ibid., 924, no. 123). Two drafts of that letter, also dated 10 May, are ibid., nos. 241, 247, and the draft of another letter of thanks from the Catholic king to Morone, dated 24 May, is ibid., no. 85.

92. Thus Fulvio Tolomei wrote to Philip II on 25 October 1573 (ibid., 922, no. 234).

93. Corrado Vivanti, *Le guerre di religione nel Cinquecento*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2007, p. 3; see M. Firpo and F. Biferali, *"Navicula Petri,"* cited above, p. 368.

94. This is known from a letter of 24 July 1572 by Onorato Caetani, captain-general of the papal infantry at Lepanto (*Lettere di Onorato Caetani*, edited by Giovan Battista Carinci, Tipi del Salviucci, Rome 1870, pp. 77-78; see FiAS, Mediceo, 4026, ff. 106rv, 243rv, 364rv; ibid., 3082, f. 51rv; BAV, Urb. lat., 1045, f. 370r).

95. See Zúñiga's letters to Don John of Austria and Philip II of 21, 22, and 26 June and 4 July 1572 (Serrano, *La Liga de Lepanto*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 330-47, 374-75).

96. FiAS, Mediceo, 4026, ff. 137rv, 147rv.

97. SAG, Estado, 923, no. 15.

98. Ibid.

99. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 421.

100. For Maximilian II's policy of religious pacification in general, see Howard Louthan, *The Quest for Compromise. Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1997; Paula Sutter Fichtner, *Emperor Maximilian II*, Yale University Press, New Haven-London 2001, especially pp. 135 ff.

101. Josef von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica und die katholische Reform in Deutschland nach dem Tridentinum*, Aschendorff, Münster West. 1972, pp. 28-29.

102. Gino Benzoni, Dolfin, Zaccaria, in DBI, vol. XL, pp. 576-88.

103. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, pp. 30-31; see José L. Orella Unzué, *Respuestas católicas a las centurias de Magdeburgo (1559-1588)*, Fundación universitaria española, Seminario "Suárez," Madrid 1976.

104. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, p. 53, also for clarification of the congregation's founding date, sometimes erroneously assigned to the second half of the 1560s.

105. Ibid., p. 93.

106. Ibid., p. 95; NB3, vol. VI, p. 344.

107. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, p. 95.

108. S. Vareschi, *La legazione del cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo*, cited above, p. 40.

109. Klaus Jaitner, *Die päpstliche Kirchenreformpolitik von Gregor XIII. bis Gregor XV.*, in France Martin Dolinar et al. (eds.), *Katholische Reform und Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich 1564-1628*, Hermagoras, Klagenfurt-Graz 1994, pp. 2-69; for a general framework, see Richard J. Ninnes, *Protestant Imperial Knights, Multiconfessionalism, and the Counter-Reformation*, in Thomas Max Safley (ed.), *A Companion to Multiconfessionalism in the Early Modern World*, Brill, Boston-Leiden 2011, pp. 155-78, especially pp. 159-61.

110. S. Vareschi, *La legazione del cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo*, cited above, p. 41; J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, pp. 107 ff.; Regina Pörtner, *The Counter-Reformation in Central Europe. Styria 1580-1630*, 2nd ed., Clarendon Press, New York-Oxford 2003, pp. 76-77.

111. Stefano Andretta, *Le nunziature in Italia nei secoli XVI e XVII*, in Alexander Koller (ed.), *Kurie und Politik. Stand und Perspektiven der Nuntiaturberichtsforschung*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen 1998, pp. 17-34, p. 18.

112. On these matters, one may begin with Giuseppe Alberigo, *Diplomazia e vita della Chiesa nel XVI secolo (a proposito di recenti edizioni di nunziature)*, in *Critica storica*, I (1962), pp. 49-66; Hubert Jedin, *Osservazioni sulla pubblicazione delle "Nunziature d'Italia,"* in *Rivista storica italiana*, LXXV (1963), pp. 327-43; and Michael F. Feldkamp, *La diplomazia pontificia. Da Silvestro a Giovanni Paolo II: un profilo*, Jaca Book, Milan 1998, especially pp. 54-55.

113. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, p. 121.

114. Klaus Unterburger, *Das Bayerische Konkordat von 1583. Die Neuorientierung der päpstlichen Deutschlandpolitik nach dem Konzil von Trient und deren Konsequenzen für das Verhältnis von weltlicher und geistlicher Gewalt*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart 2006.

115. ASV, Conc. trid., 32, f. 42r.

116. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, pp. 110-15. For a view of these problems from the Bavarian perspective, see Andrew L. Thomas, *A House Divided. Wittelsbach Confessional Court Culture in the Holy Roman Empire, c. 1550-1650*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2010, especially pp. 105-10.

117. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, pp. 157-63.

118. NB3, vol. III, p. 112, summary of the letter of 8 September 1573; see also p. 154, Morone's memorial of 10 October 1573, which, in connection with thefts from monasteries, suggested among other things that

"it would be well to conduct a diligent inquiry, because it would be easy to find the wrongdoers and have their superiors punish them. It would also be well to order the generals of those mendicant orders to send good and learned religious to Germany, to keep them in their monasteries and reform the rest."

119. Burkhart Schneider, *Die Jesuiten als Gehilfen der päpstlichen Nuntien in Deutschland zur Zeit der Gegenreformation*, in *Saggi storici intorno al papato dei professori della facoltà di Storia ecclesiastica*, Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae, vol. XXI, Pontificia Università Gregoriana, Rome 1959, pp. 269-304, see p. 282, note 46.

120. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, passim.

121. Ibid., p. 146.

122. Ibid., pp. 138-40.

123. Ibid., p. 147.

124. See above, section XIII.4.

125. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, p. 169.

126. Ibid.; see Peter Schmidt, *Das Collegium Germanicum in Rom und die Germaniker. Zur Funktion eines römischen Ausländerseminars (1552-1914)*, Max Niemeyer, Tübingen 1984, pp. 120-24.

127. NB3, vol. III, p. 33, letter of 1 June 1573.

128. J. von Krasenbrink, *Die Congregatio germanica*, cited above, pp. 170-74.

129. Ibid., pp. 174-76.

130. Ibid., p. 176.

131. Ibid., pp. 182-83.

132. Ibid., pp. 188-92.

XXV. "Take the Good When the Better Cannot Be Had": The Pacification of Genoa

1. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 373.

2. C. Vivanti, *Le guerre di religione*, cited above, pp. 78 ff.

3. For a general treatment - which, however, does not consider the events outlined here - see Céline Dauverd, *Imperial Ambition in the Early Modern Mediterranean. Genoese Merchants and the Spanish Crown*, Cambridge University Press, New York 2015, especially pp. 52 ff.

4. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 11, f. 11r; "a man," Gallio would write in his memoirs, "who, because of his prudence, his very advanced age, and his experience of six other legations undertaken at different times and under different pontiffs for the Holy See, was judged more suitable than anyone else" (Pastor, vol. IX, p. 248, note 3).

5. P. Prodi, *Il cardinale Gabriele Paleotti*, cited above, vol. II, p. 47, note 103, letter of 27 March 1574.

6. For a historiographical reconsideration of the question, see Carlo Bitossi, *L'età di Andrea Doria*, in Giovanni Assereto and Marco Doria (eds.), *Storia della Liguria*, Laterza, Rome-Bari 2007, pp. 61-78.

7. Claudio Costantini, *La repubblica di Genova nell'età moderna*, in *Storia d'Italia*, directed by Giuseppe Galasso, 25 vols., Utet, Turin 1958-2008, pp. 19 ff.; Arturo Pacini, *I presupposti politici del "secolo dei genovesi." La riforma del 1528*, Società ligure di storia patria, Genoa 1990, and Id., *La Genova di Andrea Doria nell'Impero di Carlo V*, Olschki, Florence 1999, pp. 77 ff.

8. Carlo Bitossi, *Il governo dei magnifici. Patriziato e politica a Genova fra Cinquecento e Seicento*, Ecig, Genoa 1990.

9. A. Pacini, *La Genova di Andrea Doria*, cited above, p. 20; Id., *La Repubblica di Genova nel secolo XVI*, in Dino Puncuh (ed.), *Storia di Genova. Mediterraneo, Europa, Atlantico*, Società ligure di storia patria, Genoa 2003, pp. 325-90.

10. Carlo Taviani, *Superba discordia. Guerra, rivolta e pacificazione nella Genova di primo Cinquecento*, Viella, Rome 2008.

11. Edoardo Grendi, *Introduzione alla storia moderna della repubblica di Genova*, Bozzi, Genoa 1976, pp. 75-76.

12. See, for example, Morone's letter to Gallio from Genoa of 6 May 1575, in which he expressed concern about the spread of weapons among the people and the difficulty of "keeping them in check," fearing that the situation might end in "total ruin and the creation of a popular republic" (AISARS, Morone, I, ff. 207-10; on this collection, which contains several hundred of Morone's letters, see the brief remarks by Bronisław Geremek, *Un inventaire soviétique*, in *Annales. Histoire, sciences sociales*, XV [1960], pp. 764-66).

13. Diego Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma tra Cinque e Seicento. Gruppi di potere, rapporti politico-diplomatici, strategie internazionali*, Mucchi, Modena 2018, pp. 30-31, 35.

14. Julia Zunckel, *Tra Bodin e la Madonna. La valenza della corte di Roma nel sistema politico genovese. Riflessioni sull'anello mancante*, in Matthias Schnettger and Carlo Taviani (eds.), *Libertà e dominio. Il sistema politico genovese. Le relazioni esterne e il controllo del territorio*, Viella, Rome 2011, pp. 145-91, see p. 146; Enzo Neri, *"Quietud, conformidad y libertad." La Spagna e la crisi politico-istituzionale genovese del 1575*, Università Cattolica, Milan 1990; Arturo Pacini, *"Pignatte di vetro." Being a Republic in Philip II's Empire*, in Thomas J. Dandelet and John A. Marino (eds.), *Spain in Italy. Politics, Society, and Religion 1500-1700 (Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World)*, Brill, Leiden 2006, pp. 197-225; Id., *El "padre" y la "república perfecta." Génova y la Monarquía española en 1575*, in Jesús Bravo Lozano (ed.), *Espacios de poder. Cortes, ciudades y villas (s. XVI-XVIII)*, 2 vols., Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid 2000, vol. II, pp. 119-32; D. Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma*, cited above, pp. 13 ff.

15. J. Zunckel, *Tra Bodin e la Madonna*, cited above, pp. 150-53.

16. Friedrich Edelmayer, *Genova e l'Impero nel Cinquecento*, in *Atti della Società ligure di storia patria*, n.s., XLI (2001), pp. 123-33, especially pp. 130-31; Paolo Calcagno, *"La puerta a la mar." Il Marchesato di Finale nel sistema imperiale spagnolo (1571-1713)*, Viella, Rome 2011.

17. Matthias Schnettger, *Libertà e imperialità. La repubblica di Genova e il Sacro romano impero nel tardo Cinquecento*, in Id. and C. Taviani (eds.), *Libertà e dominio*, cited above, pp. 129-44, see p. 139. During the crisis, moreover, Maximilian II entertained the possibility of exploiting the occasion to assert his sovereignty over the capital, where some of the Old Nobles had attempted to encourage imperial intervention. The very proposal that an imperial commissioner announce the *Leges novae* drawn up at Casale under Morone's direction at the end of the conflict - as occurred in analogous situations in German imperial cities - had to be hastily abandoned (Id., *"Principe sovrano" oder "Civitatis Imperialis"? Die Republik Genua und das alte Reich in der frühen Neuzeit (1556-1797)*, Philipp von Zabern, Mainz 2006, pp. 264-80).

18. After studying at Louvain and living in Antwerp, Padua, and Venice, Senarega had published in 1555 a well-received Italian translation of Cicero's letters to Atticus. He became doge in 1595.

19. A noble *albergo* could assume a public function - although it privately owned property, legacies, and entails - only if it belonged to one of the twenty-eight recognized divisions. Yet "private" *alberghi* not sanctioned by law survived, administering wealth and providing assistance to families that had belonged to them before the reforms. A law of 1559 required the members of an *albergo* to bear its surname, which from the 1560s spread the use of genealogical trees showing blood descent without mention of

other affiliated families, thereby fostering new noble ideologies with institutional and political implications (C. Bitossi, *Il governo dei magnifici*, cited above).

20. Rodolfo Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica. Legislazione, istituzioni e ceti a Genova nel Cinquecento*, Giuffrè, Milan 1981, p. 46. The name is said to derive from Andrea Doria's intention to restore "garibo" - order and proper arrangement - to the government of the republic.
21. Giovan Battista Spinola, *Commentarii delle cose successe a' Genovesi dal 1572 sino al 1576*, edited by Vincenzo Alizeri, Ferrando, Genoa 1838, pp. 15-16; see Giorgio Doria, *Un quadriennio critico: 1575-1578. Contrasti e nuovi orientamenti nella società genovese nel quadro della crisi finanziaria spagnola*, in *Fatti e idee di storia economica nei secoli XII-XX. Studi dedicati a Franco Borlandi*, il Mulino, Bologna 1977, pp. 377-94.
22. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 44. The laws of 1528 had abolished the perpetual dogeship and placed at the head of the republic a doge elected for two years, whose executive power was exercised on an equal vote with twelve governors or biennial senators chosen by lot from among those eligible and forming the Senate. The Senate held sovereign authority in civil matters; the eight biennial procurators formed the Chamber, which handled administrative duties.
23. Ibid., p. 72.
24. Ibid., p. 82; see note 4. On Canobio, see Domenico Caccamo, Canobio (Cannobio, Cannobi), Giovanni Francesco Mazza di, in DBI, vol. XVIII, pp. 154-56. R. Savelli's *La repubblica oligarchica* is fundamental for Morone's legation; see also C. Costantini, *La repubblica di Genova*, cited above, pp. 101 ff.
25. Filippo Casoni, *Annali della repubblica di Genova del secolo decimo sesto*, 6 vols., Stamperia Casamara, Genoa 1799-1800, vol. IV, p. 49; on the author, see Maristella Cavanna Ciappina, Casoni, Filippo, in DBI, vol. XXI, pp. 393-96. The preparations for Morone's reception were described to the legate himself by Canobio in a letter of 25 March 1575 (AISASR, Morone, I, ff. 56-57).
26. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 83. On Gentile, see Andrea Lercari, *La nobiltà civica a Genova e in Liguria dal Comune consolare alla repubblica aristocratica*, in *Le aristocrazie cittadine. Evoluzione dei ceti dirigenti urbani nei secoli XV-XVIII*, proceedings of the conference (Venice, 20 October 2007), edited by Marino Zorzi, Marcello Fracanzani, and Italo Quadrio, La Musa Talia, Venice 2009, pp. 227-362.
27. NG, vol. XIII/2, p. 202, letter to Gallio of 11 April 1575.
28. Ibid., letter to Gallio of 6 June 1575.
29. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 87, fasc. 387-VII, 44.
30. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 84r, letter to Gallio of 10 April 1575.
31. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 94.
32. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 87, fasc. 387-VII, 44.
33. Ibid., 46.
34. Viktor Ivanovič Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa nakanune novogo vremeni*, Akademia Nauk SSSR, Leningrad 1976, pp. 81-82, 281-83. Morone's supposed desire "to keep those tangles going" is contradicted, however, by a letter he wrote to Philip II on 1 July 1575: "I judge every delay placed in the settlement of these disputes to be most harmful, both for the service of God and for Your Majesty's private service, because the longer it is postponed, the harder it becomes to remedy these disagreements, and in a short time the evil could become incurable" (SAG, Estado, 1405, no. 196).
35. FiAS, Mediceo, 4026, f. 406r.
36. SAG, Estado, 925, no. 23, letter of 25 March; see also no. 220, letter of 3 November.

37. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, ff. 42v-43r, 74rv, letters to Gallio of 26 March and 9 April 1575; see ff. 72v-73v, letter of 7 April.

38. Ibid., f. 46r, letter of the duke of Savoy to Morone of 27 March 1575.

39. Ibid., ff. 64r, 88r, 89r, letters to Gallio of 5, 12, and 13 or 14 April 1575, the last date being difficult to read.

40. Noël Didier, *Paul de Foix à la mercuriale de 1559. Son procès, ses idées religieuses*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LVI (1939), pp. 396-435.

41. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, ff. 66r-67v, letter to Gallio of 6 April 1575.

42. As Morone was informed on 1 May 1575 (SAG, Estado, 1405, no. 28).

43. D. Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma*, cited above, p. 33.

44. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 90r, letter to Gallio of 16 April 1575: "I made my entry into Genoa this morning without disturbance, although a great crowd was present and all due solemnities were observed. These lords and the whole city itself have shown that they were glad to see me, have treated me warmly, and have received me in the archbishop's palace, fully furnished at their expense up to this point. If deeds correspond to the words offered me at first sight, by God's grace I may hope for some good result amid the great turbulence visible in these divided tempers, each hardened on its own side. Tomorrow the Mass of the Holy Spirit will be sung and processions held, and I shall begin, as indeed I already have, to do something good. I pray God to keep me healthy; He has also granted me the favor of suffering nothing at sea"; see ibid., 3, f. 34r, letter to Gallio of 24 March; FiAS, Mediceo, 3254, f. 158r; ibid., 1212, f. 132r.

45. See Morone's letter to him of 20 April 1575: "As Your Majesty will have learned, I came by order of Our Lord, in fulfillment of his pastoral office, to this legation in Genoa, chiefly to labor to remove the causes and, if possible, to pacify and reconcile the disturbances in this republic. Although I am a poorly suited instrument because of my weak qualities [sic], nevertheless, in order to obey His Holiness and attempt this good work for the service of God and the peace of Christendom, I have regard neither for my age nor for anything else. By God's grace I have arrived here in fairly good health, and I shall willingly strive with the zeal of charity and desire for peace that I ought to have, and with no less goodwill toward every interest of Your Majesty than His Holiness possesses" (SAG, Estado, 1407, no. 200). On the possible connection between the Genoese situation and the Netherlands, see D. Pizzorno, *Genova e Roma*, cited above, p. 34.

46. SAG, Estado, 926, no. 51.

47. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, ff. 90r, 123r, letters to Gallio of 22 April 1575; see R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 106, note 77.

48. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 135r, letter to Gallio of 29 April 1575.

49. Massimo Carlo Giannini, Odescalchi, Paolo, in DBI, vol. LXXIX, p. 154, with reference to www.treccani.it.

50. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 94, note 297.

51. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 183r.

52. Ibid., f. 119v, letter to Gallio of 3 May 1575.

53. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 96.

54. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, ff. 150r, 152r, letter to Gallio of 4 May 1575; edited with several errors by V. I. Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa*, cited above, pp. 288-300.

55. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 94, note 38, 95, note 39, 96-105.

56. V. I. Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa*, cited above, pp. 300-5, Gallio's letter to Morone and Morone's letter to Gallio of 6 May 1575.

57. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 106-8.

58. BAV, Urb. lat., 1044, f. 421r, Roman report of 7 May.

59. V. I. Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa*, cited above, p. 303, letter to Gallio of 8 May 1575.

60. BAV, Urb. lat., 1044, unnumbered folios, Roman report of 14 May.

61. "Nor, by God's grace, has a drop of blood been shed up to this point," he wrote to Gallio on 8 June 1575 (ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 293r).

62. Ibid., ff. 186r-187r, Canobio's letter to Odescalchi of 13 May 1575; see also ff. 241r-245v, the record of Morone's summoning of the vicar of the Inquisition and instructing him to investigate whether any trace of heresy could be found against those suspects.

63. Ibid., f. 277r, letter to Gallio of 2 June 1575.

64. Ibid., f. 222r, letter to Gallio of 21 May 1575.

65. Ibid., f. 303r, letter to Gallio of 11 June 1575; see also ibid., 4, f. 74r, the analogous letter of 9 September: "Several benefices in Modena have fallen vacant this month through the death of Iacomo Cortese, and I hope that Our Lord will grant me the customary favor of conferring them at my request."

66. Ibid., f. 315v, letter to Gallio of 18 June 1575.

67. V. I. Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa*, cited above, p. 309, letter to Gallio of 13 May 1575, for which we correct several obvious transcription errors.

68. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 118-20.

69. Ibid., pp. 122-25 and note 143.

70. SAG, Estado, 926, no. 65.

71. "Those exiled from Genoa are continually losing resources, money, and credit," one chronicler noted, later recording their return home "poor in money, credit, and friends, King Philip having continued and still continuing in his resolve not to pay them" (Giuliano de' Ricci, *Cronaca (1532-1606)*, edited by Giuliana Sapori, Ricciardi, Milan-Naples 1972, pp. 177, 183). Even before entering Genoa, Morone had written to Gallio that "exiles always make matters appear easier and cling to every slender thread of hope" (ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 42r, letter of 26 March).

72. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 296r, letter to Gallio of 10 June.

73. SAG, Estado, 925, no. 164; on him, see above, section XXII.1.

74. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, ff. 336r-337r, letter to Gallio of 1 July 1575.

75. Ibid., f. 358r, letter to Gallio of 4 July 1575.

76. Ibid., f. 378r, letter to Gallio of 9 July 1575.

77. Ibid., f. 290r, letter to Gallio of 7 June 1575.

78. V. I. Rutenburg, *Italija i Evropa*, cited above, p. 88. On the Milanese Birago, who had recently entered the French sovereign's service, see Roberto Zapperi, Birago, Mario, in DBI, vol. X, pp. 603-9. Morone called Fregoso "a wretched man, a Huguenot as Admiral [Coligny] was, paid by the king to conduct espionage, plots, and treachery. [...] He has every vice and must be guarded against at all costs: in France he is called the gray wolf" (R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 130, note 158). On 8 July 1575 Morone wrote in cipher to Gallio that "the Spanish ambassador is greatly troubled by this Birago's arrival and thinks he was too well received by the people; he wants him to leave soon and says that nothing could more upset [...] his king than seeing him remain here. Nor would that please me, for reasons of religion, since he is here with many people, among whom one may fear that some are tainted" (ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 3, f. 366r; see also f. 385r).

79. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 4, f. 123r, letters to Gallio of 16 September; SAG, Estado, 925, no. 227, letter to Alessandro Casali of 5 November.

80. As was promptly reported from Brussels to Granvelle on 9 October 1575 (*Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle*, cited above, vol. V, p. 405).

81. SAG, Estado, 1402, no. 211, letter of 7 November 1575, in which the dean of the College recommended Bartolomeo Coronata Pallavicino, a representative of the New Nobles, to the king of Spain, noting that no agreement could be made "without him, for he still has a large following in that city. He wishes to depend on the greatness of Your Majesty's shadow." Two weeks earlier he had accepted a secret pension assigned to him by Philip II (ibid., 1407, no. 138). On him, see Giovanni Nuti, Coronata, Bartolomeo, in DBI, vol. XXIX, pp. 298-302.

82. A. Pacini, *El "padre" y la "república perfecta,"* cited above, pp. 129-30; see R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 140-46.

83. Ibid., p. 153, for both quotations.

84. MoBE, Fondo Campori, mss γ.W.3.7 and γ.G.4.31.

85. "He also made his will as a resident in his bishopric and under the authority I had granted him according to the privileges of my legation, and he transferred several of his pensions under the license I held from the Apostolic See. I hope that his relatives will not suffer difficulty over an arrangement of this kind made by him. They have ten nephews and nieces, boys and girls, most of whom are devoted to study and virtue, and I am also confident in Our Lord's piety, that he will favor them out of justice, in consideration of the protection I must extend to them, and because he died in the service of this Apostolic See" (ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 4, ff. 272v-273r). Morone returned to the question of the succession on 30 November 1575: "He consumed his life to the very end in continual service of that Holy See and of Your Holiness, and you must know as well as I how faithfully he labored, and the particular service he rendered in the time of Pius IV [...] and at the Council of Trent, and under the preceding pontificates, and afterward down to the present" (ibid., f. 401r; see also f. 476v).

86. SAG, Estado, 925, no. 227.

87. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 4, f. 330r.

88. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 175, note 87.

89. AISARS, Morone, I, ff. 826-28, letter of 24 August 1575.

90. Paola Vismara, *Oltre l'usura. La Chiesa moderna e il prestito a interesse*, Rubbettino, Soveria Mannelli 2004, pp. 54-55.

91. The *Trattato de' cambi et in particolar de' cambi detti di Lione o di Bisenzone* was published by Giovanni Cassandro, *Un trattato inedito e la dottrina dei cambi nel Cinquecento*, Edizioni scientifiche italiane, Naples 1962, pp. 111-67; see Domenico Maffei, *Notizie su alcuni trattati cinque-seicenteschi in tema di cambi*, in Luigi de Rosa (ed.), *Ricerche storiche ed economiche in memoria di Corrado Barbagallo*, 2 vols., Edizioni scientifiche italiane, Naples 1970, vol. II, pp. 329-47; Rodolfo Savelli, *Between Law and Morals. Interest in the Dispute on Exchanges during the 16th Century*, in Vito Piergiovanni (ed.), *The Courts and the Development of Commercial Law*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin 1987, pp. 39-102; and Id., *Modelli giuridici e cultura mercantile tra XVI e XVII secolo*, in *Materiali per una storia della cultura giuridica*, XVIII (1988), pp. 3-24.

92. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 192.

93. SAG, Estado, 1407, no. 222; the draft reply expressing Philip II's pleasure at the "settlement and reconciliation of the disputes of the republic of Genoa" (*assiento y concierto de las differencias de la republica de Genova*) is ibid., 1408, no. 200, n.d.

94. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 193-94, note 138.

95. Ibid., p. 187, note 119.

96. AISARS, Morone, I, ff. 696-700, Morone's letter to Gallio of 9-10 August 1575.

97. Now preserved in MoBE, Fondo Campori, ms γ.Y.4.14.

98. AISARS, Morone, I, ff. 365-72, letter of 2 June 1575; ibid., ff. 467-75, 575-77, 883-88, letters to Ormanetto of 1 July - "these New Nobles likewise have justice in their hands and use it wherever they can against the Old, seizing on every small matter and turning it into lèse-majesté" - and 27 July - some citizens "would like to use justice as the servant of their passions" - and to Gallio of 31 August - "truly justice here needs reform more than anything else, because it is administered very badly, and because of this disorder [...] I fear some scourge of God."

99. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 188, and Id., *Diritto e politica: "doctores" e patriziato a Genova*, in *Sapere e/è potere. Discipline, dispute e professioni nell'Università medievale e moderna. Il caso bolognese a confronto*, proceedings of the conference (Bologna, 13-15 April 1989), edited by Luisa Avellini, Andrea Cristiani, and Angela De Benedictis, 3 vols., Comune di Bologna-Istituto per la storia di Bologna, Bologna 1990, vol. III, pp. 285-319. The text of the summary is in ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 4, f. 310r.

100. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 189-90.

101. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 4, ff. 69v-74r, letter to Gallio of 9 September, with a copy in AISARS, Morone, I, ff. 971-83.

102. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 195.

103. Ibid., pp. 195-96.

104. Ibid., p. 198.

105. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, f. 62v, letter to Gallio of 17 January 1576.

106. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 200-1.

107. Ibid., pp. 207-8.

108. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, f. 204r, letter to Gallio of 28 February 1576.

109. Ibid., f. 233r. The "notification made to the people in the cathedral after the Gospel" opened with the announcement that "the troubles of the republic have finally ceased and ended by the grace of God and through the work of the Most Illustrious and Reverend Cardinal Morone, apostolic legate" (MoBE, Fondo Campori, ms γ.W.3.7, f. 92r).

110. *Leges novae reipublicae genuensis a legatis summi pontificis, Caesaris et regis catholici [...] publicatae*, apud Marcum Antinium Bellonum, Genoa 1576. The first Italian translation appeared the following year in Naples (*Nuove leggi de la republica di Genova composite da li legati del sommo pontefice, de l'imperatore et del re catolico, a' quali essa repubblica havea data l'autorità di farle*, appresso Gioseppo Cacchio dell'Aquila, 1577). A bilingual edition appeared in Genoa in 1584, followed by numerous further Italian and Latin reprints.

111. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 212.

112. See above, section VII.4.

113. Rodolfo Savelli, *Potere e giustizia. Documenti per la storia della rota criminale a Genova alla fine del '500*, in *Materiali per una storia della cultura giuridica*, V (1975), pp. 29-172.

114. On 21 May 1576, for example, Maximilien Morillon wrote to Granvelle that the pacification of Genoa was no small matter, for which God should be praised, but that it was also very greatly to Morone's credit (*Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle*, cited above, vol. VI, p. 77).

115. See the first edition of Giovan Battista Lercari, *Le discordie e guerre civili dei genovesi nell'anno 1575*, edited by Agostino Olivieri, Gerolamo Filippo Garbarino, Genoa 1957, and G. B. Spinola, *Commentarii*, cited above. For the quotation from Odescalchi's letter, see R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 243.

116. C. Bitossi, *L'età di Andrea Doria*, cited above, p. 77.

117. Giovanni Assereto, *Un percorso circolare. Le costituzioni genovesi dall'antico regime al 1814*, in Antonino Giuffrida, Fabrizio D'Avenia, and Daniele Palermo (eds.), *Studi storici dedicati a Orazio Cancila*, Mediterranea, Palermo 2011, pp. 1271-86, see p. 1271.

118. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, pp. 213-14. An original copy of the capitulations, signed by Morone - his is the first signature, followed by those of the imperial commissioner Pietro Fauno, the duke of Gandía, and, last, Ambassador Idiáquez - is in SAG, Estado, lib. 64, f. 47r. On the Latin drafting, see ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, ff. 234r-235r.

119. R. Savelli, *La repubblica oligarchica*, cited above, p. 212, note 38.

120. SAG, Estado, 1408, no. 126, letter of 15 March 1576.

121. G. Assereto, *Un percorso circolare*, cited above, p. 1271, to which we also refer for what follows.

122. Carlo Bitossi, *"La Repubblica è vecchia." Patriziato e governo a Genova nel secondo Settecento*, Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, Rome 1995, pp. 153-204; Giovanni Forcheri, *Il ritorno allo Stato di polizia dopo la costituzione del 1576*, in *Annali della Società ligure di storia patria*, n.s., IX (1969), pp. 55-67.

123. C. Costantini, *La repubblica di Genova*, cited above, p. 133.

124. G. Assereto, *Un percorso circolare*, cited above.

XXVI. "Long Experience in the Affairs of the World": The Diet of Regensburg, Poland, and Russia

1. M. Schnettger, *"Principe sovrano" oder "Civitas imperialis"?*, cited above, p. 278, note 250, letter of 31 January 1576. According to Fauno's letter to Maximilian II of 27 July 1575, Morone himself saw in the "imperial bans" and the Habsburg's other means of paralyzing the republic's trade, together with papal "censures" and Spain's "nearby and ready arms," useful instruments for exerting pressure on the Genoese (ibid., pp. 270-71 and note 207).

2. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, f. 183rv, Morone's letter to Gregory XIII of 24 February 1576. As early as 23 December 1575 he had asked Gallio to intercede with the pope for a cardinal's hat, or alternatively the archbishopric of Urbino (ibid., 4, f. 569r).

3. SAG, Estado, 928, no. 42, Don Juan de Zúñiga's letter to Philip II of 26 April 1576.

4. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, ff. 254r, 261r, letters of Canobio and Morone to Gallio of 20 and 21 March 1576. "I am in my usual health," the Milanese cardinal wrote, "although visits trouble me by taking up the little leisure I hoped to have with my household. For that reason I shall dispatch them, and these other lords as well, all the more quickly, especially since I see that not even a day remains for me to arrive there, as I wish, before Holy Week."

5. BAV, Urb. lat., 1045, f. 78r, report of 7 April 1576.

6. ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, f. 281rv, postscript to the letter to Gallio of 21 March 1576.

7. NG, vol. XIII/2, p. 431, letter of 16 April 1576; see the report sent that same day by the Venetian ambassador (VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 12, f. 58r).

8. NG, vol. XIII/2, p. 441, letter of 30 April 1576.

9. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 12, f. 76r.

10. SAG, Estado, 927, no. 116, letter of 2 May 1576. On 26 April Zúñiga had written that Morone, who had arrived in Rome on 24 April and been received in a public consistory, was immediately appointed papal legate to the Diet. Although he tried to withdraw - "because he certainly has neither the health nor the age for so long a journey" - the pope insisted so strongly that he had to obey. His task was to prevent anything from being done at the Diet to the detriment of the Catholic faith (ibid., 928, no. 42); see Antonio Tiepolo's letter of 21 April (VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 12, f. 74r).

11. NB3, vol. V, p. 442, letter of 28 April 1576.

12. FiAS, Mediceo, 3082, f. 445r; see MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 87, fasc. 387-VIII, letter of Giulio Masetti to the Este duke of 25 April 1576.

13. BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 249r.

14. J. L. Orella Unzué, *Respuestas católicas*, cited above, pp. 210-11.

15. FiAS, Mediceo, 3082, f. 497r; BAV, Urb. lat., 1045, f. 124r, report from Regensburg of 20 June 1576; see also ff. 133v, 142v.

16. NB3, vol. II, pp. 11-12; see S. Vareschi, *La legazione del cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo*, cited above, pp. 50 ff.

17. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 84, fasc. 380-I, p. 5, letter of Teodosio Panizza to the duke of Ferrara of 10 November 1576.

18. Pastor, vol. IX, pp. 579-87; see the concise treatment by Joseph Hansen, *Der Cardinallegat Johannes Morone auf dem Reichstag zu Regensburg im J. 1576*, in NB3, vol. II, pp. XIII-XXX.

19. For a general overview, see Jedin, *Il papato e l'attuazione del Tridentino*, cited above.

20. Karl Schellhass, *Zur Legation des Kardinals Morone (1576; Moskau, Bayern)*, in *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XIII (1910), pp. 273-376, especially pp. 330-31.

21. NB3, vol. II, p. 151, letter to Gallio of 21 September 1576.

22. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 249.

23. A. Borromeo, Gregorio XIII, cited above.

24. According to H. Jedin, *Il papato e l'attuazione del Tridentino*, cited above, p. 631, Morone achieved "an unquestionable success whose importance for preserving Catholicism became ever clearer."

25. SAG, Estado, 927, nos. 1-3.

26. Two copies are ibid., nos. 111 and 114; see also no. 112.

27. Summarized by Pastor, vol. IX, p. 573.

28. As appears, for example, from the letter of 5 July 1576 published in *Briefe Friedrich des Frommen, kurfürsten von der Pfalz*, 2 vols., edited by August Kluckhohn, Schwetschke und Sohn, Braunschweig 1868-72, vol. II, p. 960.

29. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 580.

30. NB3, vol. II, p. 34, letter to Gallio of 15 May 1576.

31. Ibid., pp. 38-39, letter to Gallio of 25 May 1576; see also p. 40.

32. Ibid., pp. 45-46, 48, letters to Gallio of 6 and 13 June 1576.

33. SAG, Estado, 928, no. 94, Don Juan de Zúñiga's letter to Philip II of 15 September 1576; see ibid., 929, nos. 121-22, the reply of 12 February.

34. NB3, vol. II, p. 57, Gallio's letter to Morone of 23 June 1576.

35. As stated in the Instruction of 1 July 1573 for Nuncio Porcia (NB3, vol. III, p. 30).

36. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 581.

37. NB3, vol. II, p. 86.

38. BAV, Urb. lat., 1045, f. 134r.

39. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 581.

40. NB3, vol. II, p. 56, letter to Gallio of 19 June 1576.

41. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 582.

42. *Briefe Friedrich des Frommen*, cited above, vol. II, p. 590.

43. Pastor, vol. IX, pp. 581-82. A few years later Morone's conduct at Regensburg in 1576 was held up as an example by Ludovico Madruzzo, nuncio to the Diet of Augsburg in 1582 (NB3, vol. II, p. 485, letter to Gallio of 1 August 1582).

44. BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 256r, with decipherment at f. 257r. On the nuncio, besides Gino Benzoni, Dolfin, Giovanni, in DBI, vol. XL, pp. 511-19, see Daniela Neri, *Giovanni Dolfin e la sua nunziatura a Vienna presso la corte imperiale negli anni 1575/76*, in A. Koller (ed.), *Kurie und Politik*, cited above, pp. 137-47.

45. NB3, vol. II, p. 6, letter to Gallio of 29 June 1576.

46. As late as 1582, an influential pro-imperial Polish bishop such as Stanisław Karnkowski - see Teodor Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo, évêque de Mondoví, nonce apostolique en Pologne, 1574-1578*, Imprimerie Joseph Berger, Warsaw 1887, index - reminded the papal nuncio in Poland that Dolfin and Morone at Regensburg had pressed him to stand "firm in devotion to Caesar and defend his cause manfully" (Alberto Bolognetti, *Epistolae et acta 1581-1585*, collected by Ludovico Boratyński, 5 vols., edited by Edward Kuntze and Czesław Nanke, Sumptibus Academiae polonae litterarum et scientiarum, Cracow 1923-33, p. 529).

47. Ibid., pp. 51-56, letter to Gallio of 19 June 1576. A second, lengthy meeting between the Milanese cardinal and the emperor took place on 2 July and addressed Poland and the struggle against the Turk. Morone avoided discussing the Jesuit presence in German lands, although he had received instructions on the matter from Rome: "Although our intention is to serve the Jesuits, [...] the city and indeed all Germany so greatly hate these good fathers that it has not seemed advisable to mention them for now, because we still do not see that the emperor is very favorably disposed toward them" (ibid., pp. 70-75; see p. 73, letter to Gallio of 4 July 1576).

48. NG, vol. XIII/2, p. 476, Gallio's letter to Salviati of 6 July 1576.

49. Ibid., p. 502, Gallio's letter to Salviati of 6 August 1576.

50. "The archbishop of Cologne, although he presents himself as a good Catholic, is nevertheless a very eccentric and flighty man. He still dresses as a layman, with sword and dagger, and wears a little hat with an aigrette or feather in it" (NB3, vol. II, p. 83, letter to Gallio of 13 July 1576).

51. In a letter to Gallio of 19 June 1576 he called him "milder and more reasonable than all the others" (ibid., p. 55).

52. Pastor, vol. IX, pp. 582-86. While dealing with these matters, the legate found time to return to the Genoese *Leges*, as shown by documentation dated Regensburg, 2 July 1576, now in ASV, Segreteria di Stato. Genova, 5, ff. 296r-297r.

53. NB3, vol. II, p. 97, letter to Gallio of 26 July 1576.

54. BAV, Urb. lat., 1045, f. 150v, report of 6 October 1576.

55. Ibid., f. 165r; see ff. 58v, 160r, 165r.

56. Pastor, vol. IX, pp. 586-87.

57. The three Instructions are dated 23 April, 23 April, and 26 April, and were drafted respectively by Ludovico Madruzzo and Tolomeo Gallio (NB3, vol. II, pp. 12-29).

58. Ibid., pp. 24-26, Gallio's Instruction of 26 April. In the following days the cardinal of Como continued to update Morone on the Polish situation as well as the German dioceses (ibid., pp. 29-34).

59. Ibid., vol. V, pp. 473-78, letter to Morone of late June or early July 1576; see also pp. 481-82, Porcia's letter to Morone of late June or early July 1575.

60. Paolo Prodi, Antoniano, Silvio, in DBI, vol. III, pp. 511-15.

61. See Gallio's letter to him of 25 April 1576, inviting him to accompany Morone and "place his services at his disposal" (Giuseppe Boero, *Vita del beato Pietro Canisio della Compagnia del Gesú detto l'apostolo della Germania*, Tipi della Civiltà cattolica, Rome 1864, p. 359). The essays in Rainer Berndt (ed.), *Petrus Canisius SJ (1521-1597). Humanist und Europäer*, Akademie, Berlin 2000, make only brief mention of relations between Morone and Canisius at Regensburg (Karl Otmar von Aretin, *Petrus Canisius und das Problem des Religionsfriedens*, ibid., pp. 27-38, especially p. 37), and only slightly more of their relations during the final phase of Trent (ibid., pp. 35-36; and Klaus Schatz, *Zwischen Rombindung und landesherrlichem Interesse. Loyalitäten und Loyalitätskonflikte bei den ersten Jesuiten in Deutschland*, ibid., pp. 385-98, especially pp. 393-94).

62. Alexander Koller, Porcia, Bartolomeo, in DBI, vol. LXXXV, pp. 27-30.

63. NB3, vol. V, p. 542, letter to Porcia of 19 October 1576.

64. See, for example, ibid., vol. III, pp. 153-55.

65. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 483. Morone's memorial in reply to Porcia's letters of 10 October 1573 states, for example, that "the duke of Bavaria's protest concerning his claims over the benefices of his state is a matter of great importance and will create many obstacles to true reform, because this is the first point that would need reforming" (NB3, vol. III, pp. 153-56).

66. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 513.

67. Ibid., p. 480; see H. Jedin, *Il papato e l'attuazione del Tridentino*, cited above, p. 663.

68. Alexander Koller, Ninguarda, Feliciano, in DBI, vol. LXXVIII, pp. 582-85.

69. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 486.

70. Ibid., p. 481; A. Koller, Ninguarda, Feliciano, cited above.

71. Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way. The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore-London 2003, p. 271.

72. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 499.

73. S. Vareschi, *La legazione del cardinale Ludovico Madruzzo*, cited above, pp. 149-50.

74. Morone had spoken in this sense to the Spanish ambassador in June 1574, although he argued that a formal papal position would be inopportune and suggested that the emperor "negotiate with money" (*negociasse con dineros*) (SAG, Estado, 923, no. 75).

75. NB3, vol. II, pp. 24-26, Gallio's Instruction of 26 April. In the following days the cardinal of Como continued to update Morone on the Polish situation and the condition of the German dioceses (ibid., pp. 29-34).

76. Marshall Poe, *Moscow, the Third Rome. The Origins and Transformations of a "Pivotal Moment,"* in *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, XCIX (2001), pp. 412-29.

77. D. Caccamo, Canobio, cited above; see *Documenta ex archivo cardinalis Ioannis Morone ad Poloniam spectantia quae in Archivo secreto vaticano asservantur*, 2 vols., edited by Carolina Lanckorońska, Institutum historicum polonicum Romae, Rome 1984, vol. I, index, which also includes several of Canobio's letters to Morone. As will be recalled, the previous year Canobio had been sent to Genoa to prepare for the Milanese cardinal's arrival (see above, section XXV.2).

78. On him, see T. Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo*, cited above; several of his letters to Morone are edited in *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 168 ff.

79. Silvano Cavazza, *La "Relatione delle cose di Moscovia" di Giovanni Cobenzl*, in *Quaderni giuliani di storia*, XXXIV (2013), pp. 53-98, see pp. 61 ff.

80. See PM, vol. II, pp. 110 ff., 115 ff., 806 ff.; Henryk Damian Wojtyska, *Papiestwo-Polska 1548-1563*, Towarzystwo naukowe katolickiego Uniwersytetu lubelskiego, Lublin 1977, pp. 122 ff.

81. The letters sent to the Milanese cardinal by Bongiovanni in 1561-63, by Commendone in 1564, and by numerous other Polish correspondents, edited in *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, are extensively used and quoted in Ladislas Latoch's doctoral dissertation, *Aux confins du changement. Des envoyés pontificaux en Pologne-Lituanie à l'aube de la modernité 1555-1577*, supervisor Alain Tallon, Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2017.

82. On 25 January 1566 Giovanni Andrea Caligari wrote to Commendone that "on Tuesday evening, the twenty-second of this month, a congregation of many cardinals was held in Morone's chamber concerning the dispatch of the instruction for the nuncio in Poland" (*Acta nuntiaturae polonae*, vol. VI, *Iulius Ruggeri (1561-1565)*, edited by Thaddaeus Glemma and Stanislaus Bogaczewicz, Institutum historicum polonum, Rome 1991, p. 8, note 20; the instruction is published ibid., pp. 7-16).

83. Ibid., pp. 24-25, 78-79, 174-80.

84. See, for example, ibid., pp. 231 ff., 251-52, 271-72.

85. *Acta nuntiaturae polonae*, vol. VI, cited above, pp. 38-39.

86. See Domenico Caccamo, Bongiovanni, Berardo, in DBI, vol. XII, pp. 63-66; the detailed informative letters he sent to Morone are edited in *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 3 ff.; vol. II, p. 9.

87. *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, p. 85; see also p. 89.

88. D. Caccamo, Commendone, Giovanni Francesco, cited above.

89. *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, p. 137, letter of 22 March 1564.

90. For a detailed account of papal policy toward Poland in these years, see H. D. Wojtyska, *Papiestwo-Polska*, cited above; Almut Bues, *Die päpstliche Politik gegenüber Polen-Litauen zur Zeit der ersten Interregna*, in A. Koller (ed.), *Kurie und Politik*, cited above, pp. 116-36.

91. NB3, vol. II, pp. 24-25, Gallio's Instruction of 26 April 1576.

92. Ibid., p. 42, Gallio's letter to Morone of 26 May 1576.

93. Dorota Gregorowicz, *La Santa sede nei confronti degli interregni nello Stato polacco-lituano della seconda metà del Cinquecento (1572-1589). Politica e diplomazia*, doctoral dissertation, 29th cycle, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi umanistici, academic year 2016-17, pp. 153-56, 176.

94. Ibid., pp. 153-58.

95. T. Wierzbowski, *Vincent Laureo*, cited above, p. 464, letter of 9 August 1576; see D. Gregorowicz, *La Santa sede nei confronti degli interregni*, cited above, p. 114.

96. Ibid., p. 157.

97. Ibid., p. 239.

98. Silvano Cavazza, *Giovanni Cobenzl fino al 1564: la formazione di un ministro austriaco*, in Liliana Ferrari and Paolo Iancis (eds.), *Oltre i confini. Scritti in onore di don Luigi Tavano per i suoi 90 anni*, Istituto di storia sociale e religiosa, Gorizia 2013, pp. 143-52.

99. Giovanni Maniscalco Basile, *La "Moscovia" di Antonio Possevino SJ. Il resoconto di una missione impossibile*, in *Journal of Educational, Cultural and Psychological Studies*, no. 8 (2013), pp. 305-20.

100. This aspect of Morone's legation was briefly reconstructed by Paul Pierling, *Papes et tsars (1547-1597). D'après des documents nouveaux*, Retaux-Bray, Paris 1890, pp. 115-21, and later more precisely by K. Schellhass, *Zur Legation des Kardinals Morone*, cited above. Various letters from Lauro to Morone and other figures involved in the Diet of Regensburg are in *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 182-223; vol. II, pp. 271-72.

101. See the editor's comment in *Early Exploration of Russia, X. The Moscovia of Antonio Possevino S.J.*, edited by Marshall Poe, Routledge, London-New York 2003, p. 151.

102. NB3, vol. II, p. 90, letter to Gallio of 19 July 1576.

103. Ibid.

104. Ibid., pp. 102-3, letter to Morone of 28 July 1576.

105. Ibid., p. 114, letter to Gallio of 9 August 1576.

106. Ibid., p. 118, letter to Morone of 11 August 1576.

107. Ibid., p. 128, letter to Gallio of 17 August 1576; on the two feared ambassadors, see K. Schellhass, *Zur Legation des Kardinals Morone*, cited above, pp. 20-21.

108. NB3, vol. II, p. 130, Gallio's letter to Morone of 18 August 1576. Morone informed Rome that the plan to send the Lutheran bishop of Lübeck to Muscovy had been dropped, while the proposal concerning the duke of Pomerania remained, even though it was known "how much that Muscovite abhors this sect." It was then that the emperor gave his approval to sending a papal envoy to the tsar, "greatly commending this union with the Muscovite and showing that it did not displease him" (ibid., p. 132, letter of 20 August 1576).

109. Ibid., vol. III/2, p. 140, letter to Gallio of 29 August 1576.

110. K. Schellhass, *Zur Legation des Kardinals Morone*, cited above, p. 334.

111. Ibid., pp. 331-32, 341-50; see pp. 306 ff. On the little-known figure of Clencke, see Georg Schwaiger, *Die Theologische Fakultät der Universität Ingolstadt (1476-1800)*, in Laetitia Boehm et al. (eds.), *Die Ludwig-Maximilians Universität in ihre Fakultäten*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin 1972, vol. I, pp. 13-126, especially p. 69.

112. BAV, Vat. lat., 6406, f. 67r, letter of 29 June 1577; see ibid., f. 37r, his letter to Morone of 27 March 1577 on the circumstances of his absolution for heresy in the internal forum.

113. As Gallio wrote to him on 13 October 1576 (ibid., 6405, f. 334v). On the freezing German weather at the end of October, see Dolfin's letter to Morone of 26 October 1576 (ibid., f. 340r).

114. Ibid., f. 335r, letter of 14 October 1576.

115. SAG, Estado, 928, nos. 59-60, 65-66, letters of Juan de Zúñiga to Philip II of 20 and 23 November.

116. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 12, f. 236r.

117. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 88, fasc. 387-IX, 64, letter of 19 November; see also ibid., 52 and 57, letters of 24 October and 7 November.

118. NB3, vol. V, p. 552. Gallio had informed him on 12 November that the consistory would be public, communicating Gregory XIII's wish "not to allow a legation so distinguished and involving so much labor and merit to lack in this respect the customary and due honor" (BAV, Vat. lat., 6405, f. 347r).

119. NB3, vol. II, pp. 173-74.

120. MoAS, Cancelleria ducale. Ambasciatori. Roma, 87, fasc. 387-VI, pp. 1-2.

121. NB3, vol. II, p. 171, letter of 14 October 1576.

122. Ibid., pp. 175-92. A letter from Rudolf II to Morone, "our dearest friend," concerning the Rota is in BAV, Vat. lat., 6406, f. 145r.

123. BAV, Vat. lat., 6406, ff. 192r, 186r-187v, 193r-194r, 196r, 198r; VeAS, Capi del Consiglio di dieci. Roma, 26, f. 148r; see ff. 142r-143r, 144r, 151r, 152v; ibid., Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 14, ff. 62r, 122r, 281r.

124. C. Dionisotti, *Chierici e laici*, cited above.

125. Frederick J. McGinness, *Right Thinking and Sacred Oratory in Counter-Reformation Rome*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1995, pp. 3-4.

126. Simon Ditchfield, *Roma, la città del papa come icona culturale (1500-1800 circa)*, in L. Fiorani and A. Prosperi (eds.), *Roma, la città del papa*, cited above, pp. 31-72.

127. M. Firpo and F. Biferali, *"Navicula Petri,"* cited above, pp. 128-29.

128. Michel de Montaigne, *Giornale di viaggio in Italia*, foreword by Guido Piovene, critical introduction and notes by Aldo Natoli, 3 vols., Parenti, Florence 1959, vol. I, pp. 159-60; vol. II, pp. 29-30, 32; see F. J. McGinness, *Right Thinking*, cited above, p. 62.

129. Gregory Martin, *Roma sancta*, edited by George Bruner Parks, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, Rome 1969, p. 54.

130. F. J. McGinness, *Right Thinking*, cited above, pp. 89, 107, 130 ff.

131. G. Martin, *Roma sancta*, cited above, p. 57.

132. P. Giovio, *Lettere*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 67, 76.

133. Ibid., vol. I, p. 247.

134. Ibid., vol. II, pp. 67, 110-11.

135. Datable to 1578-79, the painting is in the Galleria Corsini in Rome; see R. Pancheri, *Scipione Pulzone, Bartolomeo Cancellieri*, cited above, pp. 272-75; PM, vol. III, p. 123 and the bibliography cited there.

136. *Documenta ex archivo*, cited above, vol. I, pp. 227 ff.

137. SAG, Estado, 930, unnumbered.

138. BAV, Vat. lat., 6406, f. 117r.

139. Ibid., ff. 111r, 121r.

140. See Cardinal Granvelle's letter to Margaret of Austria, duchess of Parma, of 5 September 1578 (*Correspondance du cardinal de Granvelle*, cited above, vol. VII, p. 151). For his involvement at the request of Spanish diplomacy as well, see the letters of Abbot Bernardino Briceño to Philip II of 4 April and 19 August 1580 (SAG, Estado, 938, nos. 48, 103).

141. BAV, Urb. lat., 1048, ff. 300v, 319r; PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 488.

142. BAV, Urb. lat., 1048, f. 391r.

143. Ibid., f. 400v; another Roman informant wrote to Parma that same day that "Lord Cardinal Farnese is bishop of Ostia and dean, and has greatly increased his business and with it his income by about 1,500 ducats a year" (PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 488; see also the report of 10 December in ASFi, Mediceo, 4027, f. 34rv).

144. VeAS, Senato. Dispacci ambasciatori. Roma, 14, f. 446r.

145. SAG, Estado, 934, no. 113.

146. Pastor, vol. IX, p. 885.

147. SAG, Estado, 938, no. 101; ibid., 939, nos. 2, 64, letter of 12 December 1580.

148. G. Cugnoni, *Autobiografia*, cited above, p. 366.

149. Ibid., p. 160.

150. BAV, Vat. lat., 12124, f. 320r.

151. G. Cugnoni, *Autobiografia*, cited above, p. 167.

152. PrAS, Carteggio farnesiano estero, 479.

153. See above, Introduction.

XXVII. Conclusion: The Material Legacy and Historical Image

1. SAG, Estado, 932, unnumbered, letter to Philip II of 29 March 1578.

2. The text appears in the two wills of 1575 (MiAGS, XLI. B. 1) and 1580 (MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. 7; MnAS, Archivio Casati Stampa di Soncino, 90), as well as in a note by the heirs preserved in MiAGS, XLI. E. 8 (10). For what follows, see also M. Firpo and G. Maifreda, *Vivere (e morire) da cardinale*, cited above.

3. In fact, the slab now set into the floor of the right aisle is not the original one but, as Vincenzo Forcella, *Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edificii di Roma dal secolo XI fino ai giorni nostri*, 14 vols., Tipografia delle scienze matematiche e fisiche, Rome 1869-84, vol. I, p. 547, no. 2096, attests - see p. 472, no. 1832 - a replacement for the original, which was destroyed during the restorations of 1848-55 (Giancarlo Palmerio and Gabriella Villetti, *Storia edilizia di S. Maria sopra Minerva, 1275-1580*, Viella, Rome 1989, pp. 191 ff.; see pp. 214, 226-27). This is moreover evident from the identical form and quality of the marble in the slabs inserted into the floor during the restoration works. It was probably on that occasion that, through a stonecutter's error - perhaps caused by the severe deterioration of the surface - the absurd IULII II was carved instead of FUIT, as Forcella indeed read it. Here, therefore, we have restored the original text intended by Morone and attested by Alfonso Chacón and Agostino Oldoini, *Vitae, et res gestae pontificum romanorum et sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinalium*, 4 vols., cura et sumptibus Philippi et Antonii de Rubeis, Rome 1677, vol. III, col. 682, where, however, "patrono" is mistakenly read instead of "patruo," and by Joachim Joseph Berthier, as shown by the manuscript notes later used in his *L'Église de la Minerve à Rome*, Cooperativa Tipografica Manuzio, Rome 1910, preserved in Rome, Archivio della Provincia romana di santa Caterina da Siena, Archivio di Santa Maria sopra Minerva, *Lapidario della chiesa della Minerva compilato dal padre M. G. Berthier*, Fondo Minerva (cm IIe4) 1, p. 504. Besides recording Forcella's presumed error regarding the word FUIT - while himself reading "patrono" - Berthier deplored the fact that the man who had presided over the conclusion of the Council of Trent had no monument other than a tombstone on the floor opposite the fourth chapel in the right aisle (ibid.).

4. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [48]r.

5. A. Chacón and A. Oldoini, *Vitae, et res gestae*, cited above, vol. III, col. 682.

6. G. Palmerio and G. Villetti, *Storia edilizia di S. Maria sopra Minerva*, cited above, pp. 194-96.

7. J. J. Berthier, *L'Église de la Minerve*, cited above, p. 109: "On leaving the chapel [of the Annunciation], one should look in the pavement for an epitaph that merits attention: that of Cardinal Giovanni Morone, first president of the Council of Trent. It was formerly visible on his tomb in front of the high altar, at the top of the steps separating the choir from the transept. It was moved here during the restorations of 1848-1854 and placed near the monument of Urban VII"; see ibid., p. 250; Enrico Parlato, *Esequie e sepolture romane dei cardinali veneziani*, in Caterina Furlan and Patrizia Tosini (eds.), *I cardinali della Serenissima. Arte e committenza tra Venezia e Roma (1523-1605)*, Silvana, Cinisello Balsamo 2014, pp. 329-66, especially p. 332 and note 29. The nineteenth-century transfer of the slab explains the error by A. P. Robinson, *The Career*, cited above, p. 225, who states that near Morone's tomb in the Chapel of the Annunciation lies that of Giovanni Battista Castagna, later Pope Urban VII, "who as archbishop of Rossano was prominent at the third session of Trent, thus providing a reminder of Morone's greatest triumph."

8. BAV, Vat. lat., 8777.

9. See above, section XXI.2.

10. J. J. Berthier, *L'Église de la Minerve*, cited above, pp. 428, 431, 434-35.

11. ASV, Conc. trid., 2, f. 91r, letter of the cardinal of Portugal to Morone of 21 July 1564, with interesting details about the work carried out in the Roman basilica; see ibid., f. 20r.

12. *Testamento e codicillo della signora donna Anna Moroni Stampa* (LuAMS, loose papers, f. [2]v), a printed copy of which is in MnAS, Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89.

13. J. J. Berthier, *L'Église de la Minerve*, cited above, pp. 250, 431; Leo Steinberg, *The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1983, pp. 146-47; Silvia Danesi Squarzina, *Michelangelo, un Cristo nudo per Santa Maria sopra Minerva: prima e seconda versione*, in *L'Eterno e il Tempo tra Michelangelo e Caravaggio*, exhibition catalogue, edited by Antonio Paolucci, Andrea Bacchi, Daniele Benati, Paola Refice, and Ulisse Tremonti, Silvana, Cinisello Balsamo 2018, pp. 55-63.

14. In both the will of 1575 and that of 1580 Morone expressed only the wish that his body be buried "somewhere inside the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva."

15. Alexander Nagel, *The Controversy of Renaissance Art*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago-London 2011, pp. 143-44; Dario Donetti, *Il ritorno a Firenze. Il cantiere di San Lorenzo, il marmo e il Cristo della Minerva*, in Patrizio Aiello (ed.), *Michelangelo. Una vita*, Officina Libraria, Milan 2014, pp. 147-62, see p. 160. On the plaster copy of the statue near the church of Domine quo vadis, see William E. Wallace, *Michelangelo's Risen Christ*, in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXVIII (1997), pp. 1251-80.

16. A. Chacón and A. Oldoini, *Vitae, et res gestae*, cited above, vol. III, col. 956. Professor Giancarlo Palmerio kindly confirmed to us that in the underground area at the feet of Michelangelo's Christ, stacked haphazardly against the ancient Roman walls beneath the church, are wooden burial coffins that were certainly used, of varying sizes and sometimes partly open because of tampering or the removal of remains for transfer to an ossuary.

17. PM, vol. II, pp. 1025 ff.; NB1, vol. XVII, pp. 390-91; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 467.

18. See above, sections IX.3 and X.4.

19. MiAGS, XLI. E. 1: *Descrizione dell'eredità del signor cardinale Morone, cioè porzione del medesimo a' beni di Niguarda, porzione sopra beni di Rovederio, porzione su la casa da nobile signore nella contrada de' Moroni a Milano* (seventeenth-century papers).

20. Ibid., XLI. E. 8.

21. As appears from his will of 22 March 1575 (RoAS, Notai. Auditor Camerae, notary Iacobus Gilardus, 3569, ff. 341r-343v). The natural son of Giovanni Antonio Morone, who died prematurely, Giulio was legitimized in 1554 (see above, section IX.4). He married his distant cousin Lucia Morone in 1552, had numerous children, and died in 1581. In 1578 one of his daughters became involved in a sexual scandal arising from a "transaction that occurred in the house of my sister, the lady marchioness," as Morone wrote to Borromeo that year (M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, p. 222).

22. ASV, Cam. Ap. Div. Cam., 223, f. 224rv, *motu proprio* of Pius V of 8 July 1568, renewed under Gregory XIII on 10 December 1572 (ibid., 248, f. 169r).

23. R. Pancheri, *Scipione Pulzone, Bartolomeo Cancellieri*, cited above, pp. 278-79.

24. MiAGS, XLI. E. 4 (2). The brief of 13 January 1562 is attested only by the two wills signed by Morone in 1575 and 1580, cited shortly below. It may not be accidental that it was issued shortly before the death of Morone's mother, Amabilia Fissiraga, on 10 February 1562 (LuAMS, 4, fasc. M9, subfasc. 1, f. 4r).

25. MiAGS, XLI. E. 4 (4).

26. Ibid. The brief of 14 May 1571 is likewise attested only by Morone's wills.

27. Ibid., XLI. B. 1.

28. Equal to approximately 2,700 kilograms.

29. We know this will from the copy preserved in MoAS, Giurisdizione sovrana. Vescovi di Modena. Morone Giovanni, 264, fasc. 7, which also contains a typescript transcription, and from the two copies in MnAS, Archivio Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89.

30. MiAGS, XLI. B. 1.

31. He was then sixty-two years old, as appears from the funerary inscription placed six years later by his heirs beneath the pulpit of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, where he is described as "uniquely dear to Cardinal Giovanni Morone, in whose household he had grown old" (*Ioanni Morono cardinali, cuius in familia senuerat, unice carus*).

32. On him, see PM, vol. I, p. 527, note 27.

33. See above, section XXVI.5.

34. In her will of 30 October 1583, the wealthy marchioness of Soncino also provided that, if her branch of the family became extinct, Girolamo was to be replaced by Orazio - despite his illegitimate birth - and his male descendants, then by those of his sister Amabilia, who had married Catalano Gallarati, and, if that branch too became extinct, by the descendants of Policarpo, son of Giulio Morone and founder of the Roman branch of the family. This shows that, in her eyes, roots in Milan were more important than the surname. A copy of the marchioness's will is preserved in LuAMS, loose papers, see ff. 16v ff. On the widespread use of entails, see Nicola La Marca, *La nobiltà romana e i suoi strumenti di perpetuazione del potere*, 2 vols., Bulzoni, Rome 2003, vol. I, pp. 15 ff.

35. G. van Gulik and C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica*, cited above, vol. III, p. 307. This characteristic method of remunerating relatives and household members had already been used in January 1560, when the ever-faithful secretary Filippo Gheri was appointed to succeed the late Cardinal Virgilio Rosario in the diocese of Ischia. Rosario had been one of Morone's inquisitors, and Gheri also obtained a pension of 500 scudi charged upon the see of Tropea (ibid., pp. 214, 320, note 8; see B. McClung Hallman, *Italian Cardinals*, cited above, p. 99). In her will of 1583 Anna Morone Stampa would leave her nephew Orazio 1,000 scudi and an annual pension of 100 scudi payable by her universal heir, Girolamo Morone (LuAMS, loose papers, f. [8]rv).

36. SAG, Estado, 930 (unnumbered).

37. Substantial revenues charged upon the estate transmitted to the nephew would instead be reserved for this "only and most beloved sister" in Anna Morone Stampa's will of 30 October 1583 (LuAMS, loose papers, ff. 4v ff.).

38. *Documenti per la famiglia Moroni*, in *Bollettino storico della Svizzera italiana*, XII (1890), pp. 40-42.

39. F. Calvi, *Famiglie notabili milanesi*, cited above, vol. II, Morone, table III.

40. RoAS, Notai Auditor Camerae, notary Iacobus Gilardus, 3569, ff. 341r-343v.

41. See above, section XXVII.2.

42. Lina Montalto, *Un mecenate in Roma barocca. Il cardinale Benedetto Pamphilj (1653-1730)*, Sansoni, Florence 1955, p. 44.

43. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [36]r.

44. On the importance of the chamberlain, a high-ranking office in cardinalatial as well as other courts and one generally associated with luxurious dress, see, for example, L. Montalto, *Un mecenate in Roma barocca*, cited above, p. 58. The steward presided over the table, although he did not choose the dishes, a responsibility belonging to the head cook (ibid., p. 84). The year before the cardinal's death, a daughter of the steward was seduced by the knight Giovan Francesco Trecco. This became the subject of an intense correspondence between Morone and Borromeo, who advised his colleague to have the apostolic nuncio at the imperial court intervene, since Trecco had meanwhile moved to Prague (M. Sangalli, *Due principi della Chiesa*, cited above, p. 222).

45. L. Nussdorfer, *Masculine Hierarchies*, cited above, pp. 627 ff.

46. The office of wardrobe master was a position of great trust, since it usually entailed custody of the family papers, valuable furnishings, jewels, tapestries, paintings, and fine fabrics (L. Montalto, *Un mecenate in Roma barocca*, cited above, p. 46).

47. The master of the household in cardinalatial residences was often the cardinal's closest collaborator and secretary; it was therefore more a bureaucratic and political position than a strictly domestic one. See, for example, David S. Chambers, "The Housing Problems of Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga," in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXXIX (1976), pp. 21-58; idem, "Bartolomeo Marasca, Master of Cardinal Gonzaga's Household (1462-1469)," in *Aevum*, LXIII (1989), pp. 265-83; L. Nussdorfer, *Masculine Hierarchies*, cited above, pp. 630 ff.

48. This was the highest official in the administration of the kitchen and table, and the custodian of the silverware, crystal, and tableware (L. Montalto, *Un mecenate in Roma barocca*, cited above, pp. 77-81; Pierluigi Ridolfi, *Rinascimento a tavola. La cucina e il banchetto nelle corti italiane*, Donzelli, Rome 2015, pp. 5 ff.).

49. The person who, during ceremonies, held the edges of the cardinal's robe.

50. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [36]r.

51. Ibid., f. [26]r.

52. MnAS, Archivio Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89, *Confessi dei legatarii e creditori del cardinale Giovanni Morone*, notary Marc'Antonio Brutto, 22 February 1581, unnumbered folios. The names of the "painter" Marc'Antonio and the "sculptor" Cesare do not appear in the list.

53. MiAGS, ff. [35]v, [48]v.

54. G. Fragnito, "Parenti" e "familiari," cited above, p. 576 and note 67.

55. P. Partner, *Renaissance Rome*, cited above, p. 135; Lucinda Byatt, "The Concept of Hospitality in a Cardinal's Household in Renaissance Rome," in *Renaissance Studies*, II (1988), pp. 312-20, especially p. 313; Pierre Hurtubise, *La «familia» del cardinale Giovanni Salviati (1517-1553)*, in C. Mozzarelli (ed.), *«Familia» del*

principe e famiglia aristocratica, cited above, vol. II, pp. 589-609, especially p. 603; idem, *Familiarité et fidélité à Rome au XVIe siècle: les «familles» des cardinaux Giovanni, Bernardo et Antonio Maria Salviati*, in Yves Durand (ed.), *Hommage à Roland Mousnier. Clientèles et fidélités en Europe à l'époque moderne*, PUF, Paris 1981, pp. 335-50; idem, *La table d'un cardinal de la Renaissance. Aspects de la cuisine et de l'hospitalité à Rome au milieu du XVIe siècle*, in *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, XCII (1980), pp. 249-82, 258; G. Fragnito, "Parenti" e "familiari," cited above, pp. 569-71, 581-82, note 35; M. Hollingsworth, *A Taste for Conspicuous Consumption*, cited above, p. 133.

56. G. Fragnito, "Cardinal's Courts," cited above, p. 43.
57. Massimo Carlo Giannini, "Olgiati, Bernardo," in DBI, vol. LXXIX, p. 200 (with reference to www.treccani.it).
58. See, for example, MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [44]v, [45]v.
59. Ibid., f. [48]v.
60. See, for example, ibid., f. [39]v.
61. R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. II, pp. 496-98.
62. AGSMi, XLI. B. 1.
63. Ibid., XLI. E. 2, ff. [39]v (the "Modena pension amounts to 685:41:0.5 scudi in currency," accrued "until the death of the lord cardinal"; since there is no indication of payment in installments, it may be assumed that this was an annual payment of approximately 60 scudi per month) and [46]r.
64. On the bequest, see ibid., ff. [44]v, [47]r; L. G. Marini, *Degli archiatri pontifici*, cited above, pp. 461, 469-71.
65. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [9]r, [11]v, [12]v, [18]r, [19]r, [20]r, [25]v, [80]r.
66. R. Pancheri, *Scipione Pulzone, Bartolomeo Cancellieri*, cited above, pp. 276-77.
67. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [36]r.
68. Rodolfo Lanciani, *Storia degli scavi di Roma e notizie intorno alle collezioni romane di antichità*, 4 vols., E. Loescher & C., Rome 1902-12, vol. III, pp. 189-90. On Villamarina, see PM, vol. I, p. 17, note 38.
69. See above, section XV.4.
70. Giovan Paolo Lomazzo, *Rime […] divise in sette libri*, Paolo Gottardo Pontio, Milan 1587, p. 532.
71. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [33]r-[35]r, [75]v-[80]v, [87]rv. The inventory of Cardinal Giovanni Salviati's possessions drawn up immediately after his death in 1550 listed silverware, jewels, cameos, and medals worth more than 6,000 scudi (P. Hurtubise, *Une famille-témoin*, cited above, p. 276).
72. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [33]v, [76]r, [87]rv.
73. Ibid., ff. 39r-41v.
74. Ibid., f. [3]rv.
75. Ibid., ff. [48]v-[49]r, [57]v. On the lending activity of the Santa Casa in the early modern period, see Marco Moroni, *L'economia di un grande santuario europeo. La Santa Casa di Loreto tra basso Medioevo e Novecento*, FrancoAngeli, Milan 2000.
76. By tradition, when cardinals received the ring - made of gold and sapphire and bearing the arms of the pope who had conferred the title - they were required to pay a tax that, in the sixteenth century, was customarily passed on to their heirs.
77. *Processi Carnesecchi*, vol. II, pp. 419, 492; according to Beccadelli, Pole would not have left "great wealth" to his heirs (*Monumenti di varia letteratura*, cited above, vol. I/2, p. 320); see T. F. Mayer, *Cardinal Pole's Finances*, cited above, pp. 9, 12.
78. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [11]rv, [12]v, [18]v, [20]r, [25]r-26r, [27]r, [28]r, [30]r (see f. [34]r, the precious "tapestry with the story of Solomon"), 77rv. On the cultural significance of the clock in the sixteenth century, see R. Sacchi, *Il disegno incompiuto*, cited above, vol. I, p. 282.
79. *Firenze e la Toscana dei Medici nell'Europa del Cinquecento*, vol. II, *Palazzo Vecchio: committenza e collezionismo medicei, 1537-1610*, exhibition catalogue, Electa-Alinari, Milan-Florence 1980, pp. 157 ff. The contemporary residences of Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who died in 1572, likewise contained abundant leather furnishings, including "gold and green leathers made in sections with terms and tall eagles" (Carmelo Occhipinti, *Giardino delle Esperidi. Le tradizioni del mito e la storia di Villa d'Este a Tivoli*, Carocci, Rome

2009, especially p. 168). For broader comparisons, see Alessandra Rodolfo and Caterina Volpi (eds.), *Vestire i palazzi. Stoffe, tessuti e parati negli arredi e nell'arte del Barocco*, Vatican Museums, Vatican City 2014.

80. MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, ff. [18]r, [19]v, [25]rv, [40]rv.

81. Renata Ago, *Il gusto delle cose. Una storia degli oggetti nella Roma del Seicento*, Donzelli, Rome 2006, pp. 63-64; see, for example, the "fir cabinet that used to stand in Morone's chamber" (MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [11]v) and another "wooden cabinet," f. [20]r.

82. Thus defined by R. Ago, *Il gusto delle cose*, cited above, pp. 78-79; see, for example, the ten "chairs of red Turkish leather with fringes" (MiAGS, XLI. E. 2, f. [9]r), the "three chairs of red velvet, very old" (f. [11]r), the "two large chairs of tooled leather" (f. [11]r), "two other velvet chairs, one in the French style and the other ordinary" (f. [14]r), and then another eight chairs and a further twenty-five (ff. [16]r, [21]r).

83. Ibid., f. [22]v.

84. PM, vol. II, pp. 21 ff.

85. MiAGS, XI. B. 1.

86. The relevant documentation is in MnAS, Archivio Casati Stampa di Soncino, 89 and register 486; the entail of 1580 is ibid., ff. 49r ff.

87. Ibid., register 486, ff. 54v, 58r.

88. Ibid., ff. 90r-91v. The appraised values of these paintings were almost all below 5 scudi each, with the exception of the portraits of Girolamo Morone (valued at 30 scudi) and of the marquis of Hinojosa with his wife Isabel de Velasco y Enríquez de Ribera (8 scudi).

89. Antonfrancesco Cirni, *Comentarii, ne' quali si descrive la guerra ultima di Francia, la celebratione del concilio Tridentino, il soccorso d'Orano, l'impresa del Pignone e l'historia dell'assedio di Malta*, Giulio Accolto, Rome 1567, pp. 3v, 10rv.

90. Mambrino Roseo, *Delle historie del mondo. Parte terza. Aggiunta alla notabile historia di messer Giovanni Tarchagnota*, Michele Tramezzino, Venice 1573, pp. 296r, 354v.

91. Ibid., pp. 355r-356v.

92. Elena Valeri, *L'Italia travagliata dell'inquisitore Umberto Locati (1503-1587)*, in *Nunc alia tempora, alii mores*, cited above, pp. 311-34, especially pp. 333-34; P. Scaramella, *Una memoria non condivisa*, cited above, p. 226.

93. Faustino Tasso, *Historie de' successi de' nostri tempi*, Domenico & Gio. Battista Guerra brothers, Venice 1583, p. 537.

94. Giovambattista Adriani, *Istoria de' suoi tempi*, Giunti press, Florence 1583, p. 501.

95. Ibid., p. 574.

96. See above, section XXVI.5.

97. *In funere illustrissimi cardinalis Ioannis Moroni*, cited above, p. 2v.

98. Ibid., pp. 4r, 6r, 7r.

99. Ibid., pp. 9r-10r.

100. Ibid., p. 7r.

101. P. Sarpi, *Istoria del concilio tridentino*, cited above, vol. II, p. 1055.

102. I quote from Iacobus Augustus Thuanus, *Historiarum sui temporis ab anno Domini 1543 usque ad annum 1607 libri CXXXVIII*, 5 vols., apud haeredes Petri de la Roviere, Aurelianae 1620-28, vol. I, p. 623.

103. Ibid., p. 466.

104. Giovanni Antonio Pietramellara, *Ad librum Onuphrii Panvinii de summis pontificibus et sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinalibus a Paulo quarto ad Clementis octavi annum pontificatus octavum, continuatio*, apud haeredes Ioannis Rossii, Bononiae 1609, pp. 247-49.

105. A. Chacón and A. Oldoini, *Vitae, et res gestae*, cited above, vol. III, cols. 680-83.

106. Giovan Battista Del Tufo, *Historia della religione de' padri cherici regolari*, Guglielmo Facciotto and Stefano Paolini, Rome 1609; Giovanni Battista Castaldo, *Vita del santissimo pontefice Paolo quarto fondatore della religione de' chierici regolari e memorie d'altri cinquanta celebri padri che in essa fiorirono nel secolo*

passato 1500 et hora riposano in pace, Giacomo Mascardi, Rome 1615; Giuseppe Silos, *Historia clericorum regularium a congregatione condita*, 3 vols., typis Vitalis Mascardi, Romae 1650-66; see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 582 ff., and especially Eleonora Belligni's essay, *La storiografia teatina fra Cinque e Seicento*, in *Nunc alia tempora, alii mores*, cited above, pp. 141-68.

107. A. Caracciolo, *Vita et gesti di Giovanni Pietro Carafa*, cited above, ff. 193r-194v, 209v-211v, 271r-273r, 295v, 405r ff., 509rv. On him and his work, see M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 537 ff.
108. A. Caracciolo, *De vita Pauli quarti*, cited above, p. 169.
109. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, p. 578.
110. Ibid., pp. 583-84.
111. Ibid., p. 589.
112. A. Caracciolo, *De vita Pauli quarti*, cited above, p. 170.
113. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 549-51.
114. E. Belligni, *La storiografia teatina*, cited above, p. 167.
115. Pietro Sforza Pallavicino, *Lettere*, collected by Giambattista Galli Pavarelli, Cambi and La Noú, Venice 1678, pp. 599-616.
116. Ibid., p. 71; on him, see Eleonora Belligni's essay, *Il concilio di Trento tra storia e apologia: Sforza Pallavicino*, in Michela Catto and Adriano Prosperi (eds.), *Trent and Beyond*, cited above, pp. 61-79.
117. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 586 ff.; see idem, *Cor unum et anima una in Domino*, cited above, pp. 210 ff.
118. Pietro Sforza Pallavicino, *Istoria del concilio di Trento*, 2 vols., press of Angelo Bernabò dal Verme, heir of Manelfi, Rome 1656-57, vol. II, p. 97.
119. Ibid., p. 107.
120. Ibid., pp. 127-28.
121. M. Firpo, *Inquisizione romana*, cited above, pp. 586 ff.
122. We quote from the edition Louis Moréri, *Le grand dictionnaire historique*, 16 vols., chez François Pitteri, Paris, and sold in Venice, 1743-49, vol. XII, p. 668.
123. Ferdinando Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, 2nd ed., 10 vols., apud Sebastianum Coleti, Venetiis 1717-22, vol. II, col. 136.
124. Johann Georg Fricke, *De Ioanne Morono, sanctae romanae Ecclesiae cardinali, articulisque quibus ab Inquisitionis officio iussu Pauli IV olim tanquam lutheranismi suspectus et in vinculis detentus accusabatur observatio*, in Johann Georg Schelhorn, *Amoenitates literariae, quibus variae observationes, scripta item quaedam, anecdota et rariora opuscula exhibentur*, 14 vols., apud Daniel. Bartholomaei et filium, Francofurti et Lipsiae 1725-31, vol. XII, pp. 537-86, especially pp. 546, 552, 560-61.
125. Odorico Rinaldi, *Annales ecclesiastici ab anno 1198, ubi desinit cardinalis Baronius*, vol. XV, typis Leonardi Venturini, Lucae 1756, p. 44.
126. G. Tiraboschi, *Biblioteca modenese*, cited above, vol. III, pp. 311-12; see also idem, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, cited above, vol. VII/1, pp. 300-6.
127. Lorenzo Cardella, *Memorie storiche de' cardinali della santa romana Chiesa*, 9 vols., Pagliarini press, Rome 1792-97, vol. IV, pp. 240-45.
128. Gaetano Moroni, *Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica*, 103 vols., Tipografia Emiliana, Venice 1840-78, vol. XLVI, pp. 299-302.
129. P. Scaramella, *Una memoria non condivisa*, cited above.
130. See above, Introduction.
131. See above, section XX.6.

Name Index

In compiling this index, Giovanni Morone, Jesus Christ, persons mentioned in book titles, and the publishers and printers of works cited in the notes have not been included.

Abbati, Giulio.
Abissino, see Giovan Battista, member of Pius IV's household, known as the Abyssinian.
Abramo.
Accolti, Benedetto, cardinal.
Accolti, Benedetto (the younger, nephew of the preceding).
Aceti de' Porti, Serafino.
Acquaviva, family.
Acqui, bishop of, see Fauno, Pietro.
Adamo.
Addante, Luca.
Adelasio, Domenico.
Adorni Braccesi, Simonetta.
Adorno, Raffaello.
Adriani, Giovambattista.
Adriano VI (Adriaan Florenszoon Boeyens), pope (1522-1523).
Affanni, Anna Maria.
Agnolo di Tori, see Bronzino.
Ago, Renata.
Agostino da Vimercate.
Agostino di Ippona, saint.
Agrippa di Nettesheim, Cornelio.
Aiello, Patrizio.
Alba, duke of, see Álvarez de Toledo, Fernando.
Albèri, Eugenio.
Alberigo, Giuseppe.
Alberti, Durante.
Alberti, Leandro.
Alberto di Brandeburgo, see Hohenzollern, Alberto di, cardinal.
Alberto V di Wittelsbach, duke of Bavaria.
Alberzoni, Maria Pia.
Albino, Gentile.
Alciati, Andrea.
Alciati, Francesco.
Aldobrandini, Giovanni, cardinal.
Aldrovandi, Teseo.
Aldrovandi, Ulisse.
Aleandri Barletta, Edvige.
Aleandro, Girolamo, cardinal.
Alessandrino, cardinal, see Bonelli, Michele.
Alessandrino, cardinal (Michele Ghislieri), see Pio V, pope and saint.
Alessandro VI (Rodrigo Borgia), pope (1492-1503).
Alessandro de' Medici, duke of Florence.
Alfani, Guido.
Alfonso I d'Este, duke of Ferrara.
Alfonso II d'Este, duke of Ferrara.
Alighieri, Dante, see Dante Alighieri.

Aliprandi, Stefano.
Al Kalak, Matteo.
Alois, Giovan Francesco.
Alonge, Guillaume.
Altemps, family, see Sittich von Hohenems.
Altemps, cardinal, see Sittich von Hohenems (Altemps), Marco.
Altoviti, Antonio.
Altoviti, Bindo.
Álvarez de Toledo, family.
Álvarez de Toledo, Fernando.
Álvarez de Toledo, Juan, cardinal.
Álvarez de Toledo, Pedro.
Álvarez-Ossorio Alvariño, Antonio.
Amabile, Luigi.
Amante, Bruto.
Amaseo, Pompilio.
Amaseo, Romolo.
Ambrosini, Federica.
Ambrosioni, Anna Maria.
Amiel, Charles.
Amulio, Marcantonio, cardinal, see Da Mula, Marcantonio.
Anatra, Bruno.
Ancel, René.
Andenna, Cristina.
Andenna, Giancarlo.
Andrea da Volterra, see Ghetti, Andrea.
Andreasi, Giorgio.
Andrés Martín, Melquíades.
Andretta, Stefano.
Angelini, Annalisa.
Angelo da Diacceto, see Cattani, Angelo.
Angelozzi, Giancarlo.
Angoulême, Margherita di, see Margherita di Angoulême, queen of Navarre.
Anguissola, Lucio.
Anna, saint.
Antonelli, Armando.
Antoniano, Silvio, cardinal.
Antonielli, Livio.
Antonini, Egidio, see Egidio da Viterbo.
Antonio Maria Zaccaria, saint.
Antonovics, A. V.
Antonucci, Annalisa.
Appiani, Teofilo.
Aprosio, Camillo.
Aquilecchia, Giovanni.
Aquileia, patriarch of, see Grimani, Giovanni.
Arabeyre, Patrick.
Aragona d'Avalos, Maria d'.
Aragona Tudor, Caterina d', queen of England.
Arasse, Daniel.
Arborio di Gattinara, Bartolomeo.
Arcangeli, Letizia.
Arcangelo da Padova.
Archinto, Filippo.
Arese, Franco.
Aretin, Karl Otmar von.

Aretino, Pietro.
Argelati, Filippo.
Ario.
Ariosto, Ludovico.
Aristotele.
Armogathe, Jean-Robert.
Arnold, John H.
Arras, bishop of, see Perrenot de Granvelle, Antoine, cardinal.
Arrigoni, Pier Paolo.
Arrivabene, Giovan Francesco.
Asbach, Olaf.
Asburgo, family.
Asburgo, Alberto d', cardinal, later ruler of the Southern Netherlands.
Asburgo, Andrea d', cardinal.
Asburgo, Carlo d', see Carlo V d'Asburgo, emperor.
Asburgo, Carlo d', duke of Styria.
Asburgo, Ernesto d'.
Asburgo, Ferdinando d', count of Tyrol.
Asburgo, Ferdinando d', prince of Asturias.
Asburgo, Giovanni d' (Juan de Austria).
Asburgo, Margherita d', queen of Spain.
Asburgo de' Medici (later Farnese), Margherita.
Asburgo di Savoia, Maria d'.
Asor Rosa, Alberto.
Asprey, Christopher.
Assereto, Giovanni.
Assia, landgrave of, see Filippo di Wittelsbach.
Atanagi, Dionigi.
Attico, Tito Pomponio.
Attracino, Sebastiano.
Attwood, Philip.
Aubert, Alberto.
Augusta, cardinal of, see Truchsess von Waldburg, Otto.
Augustijn, Cornelis.
Augustín, Antonio.
Augusto, Gaio Giulio Cesare Ottaviano, emperor.
Augusto I Wettin, elector of Saxony.
Avalos d', family.
Avalos, Alfonso d'.
Avalos, Francesco Ferdinando d'.
Avalos d'Aragona, Innico d', cardinal.
Avellini, Luisa.
Averroè.
Aviz, family.
Avogari, Giulio.
Azevedo y Toledo, Pedro Enríquez, count of Fuentes.
Azzolini, Lidia.
Babbi, Francesco.
Badia, Tommaso, cardinal.
Bagno, Giovan Francesco.
Bailey, Gauvin Alexander.
Baissey, Louis de.
Balbi, Angelo.
Baldo degli Ubaldi, see Ubaldi, Baldo degli.
Balsamo, Jean.
Bamji, Alexandra.

Bandinelli, Baccio.
Bangert, William V.
Barba, Giovan Giacomo.
Barbaro, Daniele.
Barbaro, Ermolao.
Barbarossa, see Khayr ad-Dīn.
Barbavara, Marco.
Barberi, Francesco.
Barberini, family.
Barbero, Alessandro.
Barbiche, Bernard.
Barbieri, Edoardo.
Barbieri, Erasmo.
Bardazzi, Giovanni.
Bargellesi, Niccolò.
Barignani, Fabio.
Barocchi, Paola.
Baroni, Evangelista.
Baronio, Cesare, cardinal.
Barozzi, Iacopo, known as Vignola.
Bartoccio, Bartolomeo.
Bartoli, Bernardo.
Bartoli, Cosimo.
Bartolo da Sassoferrato.
Bartolomeo, saint.
Bartolomeo della Mirandola.
Bartolomeo della Pergola.
Bascapè, Marco.
Basdevant-Gaudemet, Brigitte.
Bassani, Ludovico.
Bassiano, Ulisse.
Bataillon, Marcel.
Báthory, Stefano, see Stefano I Báthory, voivode of Transylvania, later king of Poland.
Battista da Crema, see Carioni, Battista.
Battistella, Antonio.
Bauer, Stefan.
Bavella, Tommaso.
Baviera, duke of, see Alberto V di Wittelsbach.
Beccadelli, Ludovico.
Beccadelli, Tommaso Maria.
Beccio, Francesco.
Bechyně, Petr.
Becker, Rotraud.
Becket, Thomas, see Tommaso Becket, saint.
Bedouelle, Guy.
Belcastro, bishop of, see Giacomelli, Giacomo.
Beliardi, Laura.
Bellabarba, Marco.
Bellarmino, Roberto, cardinal, see Roberto Bellarmino, saint.
Bellay, Jean du, cardinal.
Bellencini, Aurelio.
Bellencini, Cesare.
Bellencini, Francesco.
Belligni, Eleonora.
Belo (Belli), Vincenzo.
Bembo, Pietro, cardinal.

Benazzi, Lattanzio.
Benedetti, Marina.
Benedetto da Mantova.
Benedetto da Mantova, see Fontanini, Benedetto.
Benedict, Philip.
Benoît, Fernand.
Benrath, Karl.
Bentinck, Cavendish.
Bentivoglio, family.
Bentivoglio, Cornelio.
Bentivoglio, Giovanni Paolo.
Bentivoglio, Guido.
Bentivoglio, Marcantonio.
Bentivoglio, Muzio Sforza.
Benzoni, Gino.
Bergamo, bishop of, see Soranzo, Vittore.
Bergomozzi, Giovanni.
Bergonzi, Bernardo.
Bernabei, Nicola.
Bernardi, Antonio.
Bernardini, Bernardino.
Bernardini, Paolino.
Bernardino da Siena (Bernardino degli Albizzeschi), saint.
Bernardino da Siena, see Ochino, Bernardino.
Bernardo di Chiaravalle, saint.
Bernasconi, Carlo.
Bernaudo, Consalvo.
Berndt, Rainer.
Bertano, Gurone.
Bertano, Pietro, cardinal.
Bertari, Giovanni.
Berthier, Joachim Joseph.
Bertini, Giuseppe.
Bertomeu Masiá, María José.
Berzosa, Juan de, see Verzosa, Juan de.
Besozzi, Gian Pietro.
Betri, Maria Luisa.
Bettarini, Rosanna.
Betti, Antonio Maria.
Bèze, Théodore de.
Bianchetti, Cesare.
Bianchetti, Giovanni.
Bianchi, Angelo.
Bianchi, Arcangelo, cardinal.
Bianchi, Tommasino de', see Lancillotti.
Bianchini, Scipione.
Bianco, Cesare.
Bianco, Monica.
Biancolini, Pier Giovanni.
Biasiori, Lucio.
Bietenholz, Peter G.
Biferali, Fabrizio.
Bigazzi, Duccio.
Bigli, family.
Biglia, Melchiorre.
Binardi, Giovan Battista.

Binasco, Matteo.
Bindoni, Gaspare.
Bindseil, Heinrich Ernst.
Biondi, Albano.
Birago, Mario.
Birocchi, Italo.
Bitossi, Carlo.
Bizzoni, Giovan Battista.
Black, Christopher F.
Blado, Antonio.
Blennemann, Gordon.
Bobadilla, Nicolás.
Bobba, Marcantonio, cardinal.
Boccadiferro, Giovanni.
Boehm, Laetitia.
Boehmer, Eduard.
Boero, Giuseppe.
Bogaczewicz, Stanisław.
Boillet, Élise.
Boldrini, Gregorio.
Boleyn Tudor, Anne (Anna Bolena), queen of England.
Bollani, Domenico.
Bolognetti, Alberto.
Bonanni, Cherubino.
Bonaventura da Bagnoregio, saint.
Bonavita, Andrea.
Boncompagni, Ugo, cardinal, see Gregorio XIII, pope.
Bonelli, Giuseppe.
Bonelli, Michele, cardinal.
Bonfadio, Iacopo.
Bonforte da Pavia.
Bongalli, Scipione.
Bongiovanni, Berardo.
Bonora, Elena.
Borbone, Carlo III di (constable).
Bordiga, Francesco.
Borghese, family.
Borghese, Camillo, cardinal, see Paolo V, pope.
Borghese, Marcantonio.
Borghese, Scipione, cardinal.
Borgia, Alessandro.
Borja y Aragón, Francisco de, see Francisco de Borja y Aragón, saint.
Borja y de Castro, Carlos.
Borromeo, family.
Borromeo, Agostino.
Borromeo, Carlo, cardinal, see Carlo Borromeo, saint.
Borromeo, Federico.
Bosco, Andrea.
Bosio, Giancarlo.
Bosio, Tommaso.
Bossy, John.
Botero, Giovanni.
Botta, family.
Botta, Bergonzio.
Botta, Bergonzio (nephew of the preceding).
Botta, Girolamo.

Bottrigari, Scipione.
Boucherat, Nicolas.
Bovio, Annibale.
Bovio, Giovanni Carlo.
Bovio, Vincenzo.
Bowd, Stephen.
Bowski, William M.
Bozza, Tommaso.
Bragadin, Angelo.
Braida, Lodovica.
Brambilla, Elena.
Brancaccio, Ferrante.
Brandeburgo, elector of, see Gioacchino II di Hohenzollern.
Brandino, Paolo.
Braudel, Fernand.
Braunsberger, Otto.
Bravo Lozano, Jesús.
Brenz, Johannes.
Bretschneider, Carl Gottlieb.
Briceño, Bernardino.
Brieger, Theodor.
Brizzi, Gian Paolo.
Brizzolari, Carlo.
Broët, Pascase.
Bronzino, Agnolo di Tori, known as Bronzino.
Brown, Rawdon.
Brugnatelli, Giovan Battista.
Brugora, Maria Caterina.
Brundin, Abigail.
Brunelli, Giampiero.
Bruner Parks, George.
Brus z Mohelnice, Antonín.
Brusatori, Ambrosio.
Brutto, Marc'Antonio.
Bruzzone, Pier Luigi.
Bues, Almut.
Bullinger, Heinrich.
Bullock, Alan.
Buonarroti, Michelangelo.
Buoncambi, Vincenzo.
Burali, Paolo, cardinal.
Burgos, cardinal of (the elder), see Álvarez de Toledo, Juan.
Burgos, cardinal of (the younger), see Mendoza y Bobadilla, Francisco de.
Bury, Emmanuel.
Buschbell, Gottfried.
Busolini, Dario.
Bussani, Ludovico.
Busseto, marquis of, see Pallavicino, Adalberto.
Butzer, Martin.
Buzio, Giovanni, known as Montalcino.
Buzzi, Franco.
Byatt, Lucinda.
Bzowski, Abraham.
Caballero, Fermín.
Caccamo, Domenico.
Cacciaguerra, Bonsignore.

Cadamosto, Antonio.
Cadamosto, Bassano.
Cadamosto, Elena.
Caetani di Sermoneta, family.
Caetani di Sermoneta, Nicola, cardinal.
Caetani di Sermoneta, Onorato.
Caetano (Gaetano), cardinal, see De Vio, Tommaso.
Caffiero, Marina.
Cagnolati, Antonella.
Cairns, Christopher.
Calandra, Endimio.
Calandra, Sabino.
Calcondila, Demetrio.
Caldana, Francesco.
Caligari, Giovanni Andrea.
Calini, Muzio.
Calligari, Geminiano.
Calori, Fulvio.
Calvi, Andrea.
Calvi, Felice.
Calvi, Francesco.
Calvino, Giovanni.
Camaiani, Onofrio.
Camaiani, Pietro.
Camaioni, Michele.
Camerino, duchess of, see Cibo Varano, Caterina.
Camillo Renato, see Renato, Camillo.
Camorana, Francesco.
Campana, Guglielmo.
Campani, Cino.
Campbell, Thomas J.
Campeggi, Alessandro.
Campeggi, Annibale.
Campeggi, Camillo.
Campeggi, Giovanni.
Campeggi, Lorenzo, cardinal.
Campeggi, Tommaso.
Campi, Emidio.
Cancellieri, Bartolomeo.
Cancellieri, Francesco.
Canestrini, Giuseppe.
Canisio, Pietro, see Pietro Canisio (Pieter Kanijs), saint.
Cano, Melchor.
Canobio, Giovan Francesco.
Canossa, Ludovico da, see Ludovico da Canossa.
Cantimori, Delio.
Cantú, Cesare.
Cantú, Francesca.
Capasso, Carlo.
Capelli, Giovanni Battista.
Capilupi, Camillo.
Capilupi, Ippolito.
Capitone, Wolfango, see Köpfel, Wolfgang.
Capodiferro, Girolamo, cardinal.
Capodistria, bishop of, see Vergerio, Pier Paolo.
Caponetto, Salvatore.

Cappelletti, Gino.
Capra, Carlo.
Caprioli, Adriano.
Cara, Roberto.
Carabelli, Antonio Maria.
Caracciolo, family.
Caracciolo, Antonio.
Caracciolo, Ascanio.
Caracciolo, Galeazzo.
Caracciolo, Marino.
Caracciolo, Nicola Maria.
Carafa, family.
Carafa, Alfonso, cardinal.
Carafa, Antonio, cardinal.
Carafa, Antonio, marquis of Montebello.
Carafa, Carlo, cardinal.
Carafa, Diomede.
Carafa, Gian Pietro, cardinal, see Paolo IV, pope.
Carafa, Giovanni.
Carafa, Oliviero, cardinal.
Carandini, Bartolomeo.
Carandini, Benedetto.
Caravale, Giorgio.
Carbonell, Marta Cristina.
Carcano, Gian Pietro.
Carcereri, Luigi.
Cardano, Girolamo.
Cardella, Lorenzo.
Carena, Cesare.
Cargnoni, Costanzo.
Carile, Paolo.
Carinci, Giovan Battista.
Carion, Johannes.
Carioni, Battista.
Carlantonio di Villarosa, see De Rosa, Carlo Antonio.
Carlino, Andrea.
Carlo V d'Asburgo, emperor (1519-1556).
Carlo VIII di Valois, king of France (1483-1498).
Carlo IX di Valois, king of France (1560-1574).
Carlo di Lorena, see Guisa, Carlo di, cardinal.
Carlo Borromeo, saint.
Carne, Edward.
Carnesecchi, Andrea.
Carnesecchi, Pietro.
Carpanetto, Dino.
Carpi, cardinal of, see Pio da Carpi, Rodolfo.
Carranza, Bartolomé.
Carrasco, Manuel.
Carretta, Francesco Maria.
Carroll, Stuart.
Casadei, Alfredo.
Casali, Alessandro.
Casali, Vincenzo.
Casanova, Cesarina.
Casati, Francesco.
Caselli, Tommaso.

Caserta, bishop of, see Bernardi, Antonio.
Casoni, Filippo.
Cassandro, Giovanni.
Cassese, Michele.
Castagna, Giovanni Battista, cardinal, see Urbano VII, pope.
Castaldo, Galvano.
Castaldo, Giovan Battista.
Castellani, Camillo.
Castellani, Paolo Maria.
Castellari, Bernardino.
Castelli, Giovan Battista.
Castelli, Polidoro.
Castellino, Lorenzo, see Davidico, Lorenzo.
Castellino da Castello.
Castellione (Castellion, Chatellion), Sebastiano.
Castelvetro, family.
Castelvetro, Giovanni.
Castelvetro, Ludovico.
Castiglione, Bonaventura.
Castiglione, Branda, cardinal.
Castiglione, Girolamo.
Castiglione, Giuseppe.
Castiglione, Raffaele.
Castrucci, Vincenzo.
Catarino, Ambrogio, see Politi, Ambrogio Catarino.
Catena, Girolamo.
Caterina d'Alessandria, saint.
Caterina da Siena, saint.
Caterina d'Aragona, see Aragona Tudor, Caterina d', queen of England.
Caterina de' Medici, see Medici Valois, Caterina de', queen of France.
Catilina, Lucio Sergio.
Catone, Marco Porcio, known as Uticensis.
Cattaneo, Aurelio.
Cattaneo, Enrico.
Cattani, Angelo.
Catto, Michela.
Caula, Marco.
Caura, Bartolomeo.
Cava dei Tirreni, bishop of, see Sanfelice, Giovanni Tommaso.
Cavalieri, Tommaso.
Cavalli, Serafino.
Cavallino, Alessandro.
Cavanna Ciappina, Maristella.
Cavarzere, Marco.
Cavazza, Silvano.
Cavazzana Romanelli, Francesca.
Caverdino, Antonio.
Cazzamini Mussi, Francesco.
Cecil, William.
Cellini, Benvenuto.
Celso, Ascanio.
Centa, Claudio.
Centani, Andrea.
Ceresa, Massimo.
Ceresuola, Ludovico.
Cerruti, Antonio.

Cerutti, Simona.
Cervi, Ercole.
Cervini, Fulvio.
Cervini, Giovan Battista.
Cervini, Marcello, cardinal, see Marcello II, pope.
Cesare, «scultore».
Cesari di Novellara, Giulio.
Cesarini, Giuliano.
Cesi, Federico, cardinal.
Cesi, Giovanni Andrea.
Cesi, Paolo Emilio, cardinal.
Cesi, Pier Donato, cardinal.
Cestaro, Antonio.
Chabod, Federico.
Chacón, Alfonso.
Chambers, David S.
Chenna, Giuseppe Antonio.
Chiabò, Myriam.
Chiarino, Giovan Battista.
Chiesa, Gian Paolo, see Della Chiesa, Gian Paolo, cardinal.
Chieti, bishop and cardinal of (Gian Pietro Carafa), see Paolo IV, pope.
Chigi, family.
Chioggia, bishop of, see Nacchianti, Iacopo.
Chiozza, Battista.
Chittolini, Giorgio.
Chizzola, Ippolito.
Cibo, Innocenzo, cardinal.
Caterina, Cibo Varano, duchess of Camerino.
Cicala, Giambattista, cardinal.
Cicerone, Marco Tullio.
Cicogna, Giovanni Maria.
Cicogna, Giovan Pietro.
Cinelli, Luciano.
Cipriano, saint.
Cirillo d'Alessandria, saint.
Cirillo da Bologna, see Franchi, Cirillo.
Cirni, Antonfrancesco.
Cisieri, Alessandro.
Civa, Pellegrino.
Civita Castellana, bishop of, see Bongalli, Scipione.
Civolini, Andrea.
Clavius, Cristoforo.
Clemente VII (Giulio de' Medici), pope (1523-1534).
Clemente VIII (Ippolito Aldobrandini), pope (1592-1605).
Clencke (von Clenck), Rudolf.
Clynnog, Morys.
Cobenzl, Giovanni.
Cocciano, Augusto.
Cochlaeus, Johannes.
Coggiola, Giulio.
Cola, Maria Celeste.
Coleine, Cola.
Colet, John.
Collett, Barry.
Colombo, Ludovico.
Colonna, family.

Colonna, Ascanio.
Colonna, Camillo.
Colonna, Marcantonio, cardinal.
Colonna, Marcantonio, duke of Paliano.
Colonna, Prospero.
Colonna d'Avalos, Vittoria.
Coltre, Michele della.
Coltrinari, Francesca.
Comi, Girolamo.
Comino, Giancarlo.
Commendone, Giovan Francesco, cardinal.
Como, cardinal of, see Gallio, Tolomeo.
Concini, Bartolomeo.
Concublet, Giovan Francesco.
Condivi, Ascanio.
Confalonieri, Antonio.
Confalonieri, Girolamo.
Coniglio, Giuseppe.
Consiglieri, Paolo, cardinal.
Constant, Gustave.
Contarini, Gasparo, cardinal.
Contarini, Serafina.
Contile, Luca.
Contini, Alessandra.
Conza, bishop of, see Muzzarelli, Girolamo.
Copello, Veronica.
Cordoba, Luis de.
Corio, family.
Corio, Bernardino.
Corio, Giorgio.
Corner, family.
Corner, Alvise, cardinal.
Coronata Pallavicino, Bartolomeo.
Correggio, Girolamo da, cardinal.
Correggio, Ippolito da.
Corsaro, Antonio.
Corso, Rinaldo.
Cortenovis, Angelo Maria.
Cortese, family.
Cortese, Ennio.
Cortese, Giacomo.
Cortese, Gregorio, cardinal.
Cortese Del Monte, Ersilia.
Cortesi, Paolo.
Cosimo de' Medici, duke of Florence, later grand duke of Tuscany.
Costa, Barbara.
Costabili, Paolo.
Costantini, Claudio.
Covarrubias, Diego de.
Covini, Maria Nadia.
Crescenzi, family.
Crescenzi, Marcello, cardinal.
Crews, Daniel A.
Criscuolo, Vincenzo.
Cristiani, Andrea.
Cristiano II di Oldenburg, king of Denmark (1513-1523).

Cristina di Danimarca, see Oldenburg Sforza, Cristina di, duchess of Milan.
Cristofori, Francesco.
Cristoforo da Padova.
Cristoforo, duke of Württemberg.
Crivelli, Alessandro, cardinal.
Crivelli, Melchiorre.
Crivelli, Tatiana.
Croce, Francesco della.
Croix, Edmond de la.
Cruz, Isabel de la.
Cugnoni, Giuseppe.
Curione, Celio Secondo.
Curioni, Pietro.
Dall'Olio, Guido.
Dalmases, Cándido de.
Dal Pino, Girolamo.
Dal Pozzo Giacomo, see Puteo Giacomo, cardinal.
Damianaki, Chrysa.
Da Mula (Amulio), Marcantonio, cardinal.
Da Nadro, Silvino.
Dandelet, Thomas James.
Dandini, Girolamo, cardinal.
Dandolo, Matteo.
Dandolo, Tullio.
Danesi Squarzina, Silvia.
Daniel, Edmund.
Daniele da Volterra.
Daniels, Tobias.
Dante Alighieri.
D'Arco, Carlo.
Dauverd, Céline.
D'Avenia, Fabrizio.
Daverio, Matteo.
David, Zdeněk V.
Davide, re d'Israele.
Davidico, Lorenzo.
Dean, Trevor.
De Benedictis, Angela.
De Boer, Wietse.
De Caprio, Vincenzo.
De Certeau, Michel.
Decio, Lancillotto.
De Cupis, Giovanni Domenico, cardinal.
De Frede, Carlo.
Del Bo, Beatrice.
Del Caccia, Alessandro.
Del Carretto, Alfonso II, marquis of Finale.
Del Col, Andrea.
Del Corno, Alvise.
Del Corno, Paolo.
De Leva, Giuseppe.
D'Elia, Una Roman.
De Lion, Loris.
Della Casa, Giovanni.
Della Chiesa, Gian Paolo, cardinal.
Della Cornia, Fulvio, cardinal.

Della Croce, Pompeo.
Della Paglia, Antonio, see Paleario, Aonio.
Della Porta, Bartolomea.
Della Porta, Pietro.
Della Rovere, family.
Della Rovere, Giulio (Giulio da Milano).
Della Rovere, Giulio, cardinal.
Della Rovere, Guidubaldo, see Guidubaldo II Della Rovere, duke of Urbino.
Della Torre, Francesco, see Thurm, Franz von.
Della Torre, Michele, cardinal.
Del Monte, Baldovino.
Del Monte, Francesco Maria, cardinal.
Del Monte, Giovanni Maria, cardinal, see Giulio III, pope.
Del Monte, Innocenzo, cardinal.
Delph, Ronald K.
Del Pilar Ryan, María.
Del Re, Niccolò.
Del Tredici, Federico.
Del Tufo, Giovan Battista.
De Luca, Giovan Battista, cardinal.
De Maio, Romeo.
De Marchis, Daniele.
De Rosa, Carlo Antonio.
De Rosa, Gabriele.
De Rosa, Luigi.
Desjardins, Abel.
Deutscher, Thomas B.
Devaris, Matteo.
De Vio, Tommaso, cardinal.
Devoto, Daniel.
Diana di Valois, see Valois Farnese, Diana di.
Di Capua, Pietro Antonio.
Di Capua Gonzaga, Isabella.
Didier, Noël.
Di Donato, Francesco.
Dieguez, Alejandro Mario.
Di Filippo Bareggi, Claudia.
Dionisotti, Carlo.
Di Pietro, Roberto.
Diruta Sigismondo.
Di Simone, Maria Rosa.
Di Sivo, Michele.
Ditchfield, Simon.
Dittrich, Franz.
Di Zio, Tiziana.
Dolera, Clemente, cardinal.
Dolfin, Giovanni.
Dolfin, Zaccaria, cardinal.
Dolinar, France Martin.
Döllinger, Johann J. J.
Domenichi, Ludovico.
Domenico da Imola.
Domenico de Calaruega, saint.
Domínguez, Joaquín M.
Donati, Claudio.
Donattini, Massimo.

Dondi, Cristina.
Donetti, Dario.
Doni, Anton Francesco.
Donnelly, John Patrick.
Donnino, saint.
Donzellino, Cornelio.
Doria, Andrea.
Doria, Gian Andrea.
Doria, Giorgio.
Doria, Marco.
Doria Morone, Camilla.
Dossena, Cristoforo.
Dotti, Gaspare.
Douglas, Richard M.
Drake, Francis.
Draśković, Juraj.
Drei, Giovanni.
Druffel, August von.
Dudith, Andreas.
Dudon, Paul.
Du Ferrier Arnaud, see Ferrier, Arnaud du.
Duffy, Eamon.
Duminuco, Vincent J.
Duni, Matteo.
Dupérac, Étienne.
Durand, Yves.
Duranti, Durante, cardinal.
Durazzo, Gianluca.
Durelli, Giovanni Antonio.
Dursteler, Eric.
Eck, Johannes.
Edelmayr, Friedrich.
Edoardo VI Tudor, king of England.
Edwards, John.
Egidio da Bergamo.
Egidio da Viterbo (Egidio Antonini).
Egli, Tobias.
Ehses, Stephan.
Eisenbichler, Konrad.
Elam, Caroline.
Elio, Antonio.
Elisabetta I Tudor, queen of England (1558-1603).
Eliseo, prophet.
Elsig, Frédéric.
Emanuele Filiberto, duke of Savoy.
Emich, Birgit.
Enrico I di Aviz, cardinal, later king of Portugal (1578-1580).
Enrico II di Valois, king of France (1547-1559).
Enrico III di Valois, king of Poland (1573-1575) and later of France (1574-1589).
Enrico IV di Borbone, king of France (1589-1610).
Enrico VIII Tudor, king of England (1509-1547).
Erasmo da Rotterdam.
Erastus, Konrad.
Ercolani, Vincenzo.
Ercole II d’Este, duke of Ferrara.
Errera, Andrea.

Esaú.
Eskrich, Pierre.
Este (Estensi), family.
Este, cardinal of, see Este, Ippolito II.
Este, Ippolito I d', cardinal.
Este, Ippolito II d', cardinal.
Este, Luigi d', cardinal.
Este Bentivoglio, Cornelia.
Estienne, Robert.
Eubel, Conrad.
Eusebio, Renato, see Renato, Eusebio.
Evenden, Elizabeth.
Evennet, Henry Outram.
Faber, Martin.
Fabri, Johannes.
Facchetto, Michele.
Facchinetti, Giovanni Antonio, cardinal, see Innocenzo IX, pope.
Fahy, Conor.
Fajardo y Córdoba, Pedro, marquis of Los Vélez.
Falangonio, Giovanni Vincenzo.
Falcone, Carla.
Falloppia, Gabriele.
Fangarezzi, Riccardo.
Fanlo y Cortés, Teodoro.
Fano, cardinal of, see Bertano, Pietro.
Fanti, Giovanni Agostino.
Fanti, Mario.
Fantini, Francesco.
Fantoni, Marcello.
Fantuzzi, Galeazzo.
Farnese, family.
Farnese, Alessandro, cardinal, see Paolo III, pope.
Farnese, Alessandro, cardinal.
Farnese, Orazio.
Farnese, Ottavio, see Ottavio Farnese, duke of Camerino, later of Parma and Piacenza.
Farnese, Pier Luigi, see Pier Luigi Farnese, duke of Parma e Piacenza.
Farnese, Ranuccio, cardinal.
Farnese Cesarini, Clelia.
Farnese Sforza di Santa Fiora, Costanza.
Fattinanti Centurione, Prospero.
Fauno, Pietro.
Favre, Pierre.
Feci, Simona.
Fedeli, Pier Luigi.
Federici, Girolamo.
Federico II Gonzaga, duke of Mantua.
Federico III, elector Palatine, known as the Pious.
Feldkamp, Michael F.
Felici, Lucia.
Felicini, Giulio.
Feltre, bishop of, see Campeggi, Tommaso.
Fenlon, Dermot.
Ferdinando I d'Asburgo, emperor (1556-1564).
Ferdinando II d'Asburgo, emperor (1619-1637).
Ferdinando I de' Medici, cardinal, later grand duke of Tuscany.
Ferino-Pagden, Sylvia.

Ferlan, Claudio.
Fermo, saint.
Fernández Albadalejo, Pablo.
Fernández Álvarez, Manuel.
Fernández de Córdoba, Gonzalo.
Fernández de Quiñones, Claudio.
Fernández Terricabras, Ignasi.
Fernández Zapico, Dionisio.
Ferrara, cardinal of, see Este, Ippolito II d'.
Ferrara, duke of, see Alfonso I d'Este.
Ferrara, duke of, see Ercole II d'Este.
Ferrara, Antonio Maria.
Ferrari, Ada.
Ferrari, Ambrogio.
Ferrari, Bartolomeo.
Ferrari, Basilio.
Ferrari, Bernardino.
Ferrari, Gaspare.
Ferrari, Gaudenzio.
Ferrari, Liliana.
Ferrari, Silvio.
Ferrero, Ermanno.
Ferrero, Filiberto, cardinal.
Ferrero, Giuseppe Guido.
Ferrero, Guido, cardinal.
Ferretti, Marina.
Ferretto, Silvia.
Ferrier, Arnaud du.
Ferroni, Giovanni.
Festa, Gianni.
Fieschi, family.
Figueroa, Juan de.
Filalete, Giorgio, known as Turchetto.
Fileno, Lisia, see Renato, Camillo.
Filippo II d'Asburgo, king of Spain (1556-1598).
Filippo III d'Asburgo, king of Spain (1598-1621).
Filippo Neri, saint.
Filippo di Wittelsbach, landgrave of Hesse.
Filonardi, Ennio, cardinal.
Filoramo, Giovanni.
Fiocchi, Bartolomeo.
Fiorani, Luigi.
Fiordibello, Antonio.
Firmano, Cornelio.
Firmano, Ludovico.
Firpo, Massimo.
Fissiraga, family.
Fissiraga, Antonio.
Fissiraga Cadamosto (later Morone), Amabilia.
Fiume, Giovanna.
Flaminio, Cesare.
Flaminio, Marcantonio.
Flavio, Giovanni Paolo.
Fletcher, Stella.
Florimonte, Galeazzo.
Florio, Benedetto, see Tizzano, Lorenzo.

Foa, Anna.
Foffo, Giovanni.
Foix, Paul de.
Fontaine, Michelle M.
Fontana, Bartolommeo.
Fontana, Innocenzo.
Fontanella, Niccolò.
Fontanini, Benedetto.
Fonzio, Bartolomeo.
Forcella, Vincenzo.
Forcellino, Maria.
Forcheri, Giovanni.
Foresta, Patrizio.
Forte, Stephen L.
Foscarari, Egidio.
Foscarari, Romeo.
Foscarari, Stefano.
Foscheri, Alberto.
Fosi, Irene.
Fossati, Taddeo.
Fossati Morone, Anna.
Fosso, Gaspare dal, see Ricciulli dal Fosso, Gaspare.
Fracanzani, Marcello.
Fragnito, Gigliola.
Frajese, Vittorio.
Francesco d'Assisi, saint.
Francesco III Gonzaga, duke of Mantua.
Francesco da Meda.
Francesco I de' Medici, grand duke of Tuscany.
Francesco I Sforza, duke of Milan.
Francesco II Sforza, duke of Milan.
Francesco I di Valois, king of France (1515-1547).
Francesco II di Valois, king of France (1559-1560).
Franchi, Cirillo.
Franchi, Girolamo.
Franchino, Carlo.
Francica, Ilaria.
Francisco Borja y Aragón, saint.
Francisco de Toledo, see Toledo, Francisco de.
Franco, Niccolò.
Frangipani, Fabio Mirto.
Franzoni, Claudio.
Freeman, Thomas S.
Fregoso, Federico, cardinal.
Fregoso, Giovan Galeazzo.
Fresneda, Bernardo de.
Frey, Herman-Walther.
Frey, Karl.
Fricke, Johann Georg.
Friedensburg, Walter.
Frigo, Daniela.
Fronti, Francesco.
Frosio, Maria Luisa.
Fruscati, Placido.
Fuchs, Leonard.
Fuentes, count of, see Azevedo y Toledo, Pedro Enríquez.

Fumaroli, Marc.
Furlan, Caterina.
Gabriele VI, Coptic patriarch of Alexandria.
Gabriele, Trifone.
Gabuzio, Giovanni Antonio.
Gadaldino, Antonio.
Gaddi, family.
Gadio, Giacomo.
Gadio, Girolamo.
Gaetano (Caetano), cardinal, see De Vio, Tommaso.
Gaianino, see Giovanni Maria, Servite, known as Gaianino.
Galasso, Giuseppe.
Gáldy, Andrea.
Galeota, Mario.
Galilei, Galileo.
Gallarati, family.
Gallarati, Catalano.
Gallarati, Girolamo.
Gallarati Scotti, Fulco.
Gallarati Scotti, Tommaso.
Galletti, Giulio.
Gallio, Tolomeo, cardinal.
Gallo, Giulia.
Gallonio, Antonio.
Gambara, Brunoro.
Gambara, Cesare.
Gambara, Giovan Francesco, cardinal.
Gambara, Uberto, cardinal.
Gambarana, Vincenzo.
Gambaro, Giacomo.
Gambaro, Pietro Antonio.
Gamberini, Andrea.
Gandía, duke of, see Borja y de Castro, Carlos.
Gandolfi, Giacomo.
Ganzer, Klaus.
Garapina, see Pellotti, Bernardino.
Garavelli, Enrico.
García Hernán, Enrique.
Gardi, Andrea.
Gargano, Giovanni Benardino.
Gargano, Maurizio.
Gasbarri, Andrea.
Gaspare dal Fosso, see Ricciulli dal Fosso, Gaspare.
Gattoni, Maurizio.
Gelido, Pietro, known as Pero.
Gelli, Giambattista.
Geminiano, saint.
Gentile, Marco.
Geremek, Bronisław.
Gerhartz, Johannes G.
Gerson, Jean.
Gerwien Bayne, Charles.
Gessi, Antonio.
Getz, Christine.
Gheri, Cosimo.
Gheri, Filippo.

Ghesi, Francesco.
Ghetti, Andrea.
Ghiselli, Anton Francesco.
Ghisi, Ippolito.
Ghislieri, family (di Bologna).
Ghislieri, Filippo (Lippo).
Ghislieri, Michele, cardinal, see Pio V, pope and saint.
Giacarelli, Anselmo.
Giacomelli, Giacomo.
Giambullari, Pier Francesco.
Gianelli, Andrea.
Gianfigliazzi, Bongianni.
Giannetti, Guido.
Giannini, Massimo Carlo.
Giberti, Gian Matteo.
Giganti, Antonio.
Gilly, Carlos.
Gilmont, Jean-François.
Ginzburg, Carlo.
Gioacchino II di Hohenzollern, elector of Brandenburg.
Gioda, Carlo.
Gioioso, Natale.
Giombi, Samuele.
Giordano, Silvano.
Giorgetti Vichi, Anna Maria.
Giovan Battista, member of Pius IV's household, known as the Abyssinian.
Giovan Battista da Carpi.
Giovan Francesco da Pontremoli.
Giovannetti, Francesco.
Giovanni, saint.
Giovanni Zápolyai, king of Hungary (1526-1540).
Giovanni Battista, saint.
Giovanni da Fano, see Pili, Giovanni.
Giovanni da Montalcino, see Buzio, Giovanni.
Giovanni d'Austria, see Asburgo, Giovanni d'.
Giovanni Maria, Servite, known as Gaianino.
Giovenale, Decimo Giunio.
Giovio, Paolo.
Girardo, Giacomo.
Girolamo, saint.
Girolamo da Casale.
Girolamo da Correggio, see Correggio, Girolamo da, cardinal.
Girolamo da Fano.
Girolamo da Firenze.
Girolamo da Polizzi.
Girolamo da Siena.
Girolamo da Varese.
Giuda Iscariota.
Giuffrida, Antonio.
Giuliani, Adolfo.
Giulio II (Giuliano Della Rovere), pope (1503-1513).
Giulio III (Giovanni Maria Ciocchi Dal Monte), pope (1550-1555).
Giulio da Milano, see Della Rovere, Giulio.
Giulio Romano, see Pippi, Giulio.
Giusberti, Fabio.
Giusti, Antonella.

Giustiniani, Angelo.
Giustiniani, Paolo.
Giustiniani, Vincenzo, cardinal.
Gleason, Elizabeth G.
Glemma, Tadeusz.
Gliozzi, Giuliano.
Gnoli, Domenico.
Goffman, Daniel.
Goldwell, Thomas.
Golfi, Bartolomeo, see Bartolomeo della Pergola.
Golia.
Gómez da Silva, Ruy.
Gondola, Giovanni.
Gonzaga, family.
Gonzaga, Agostino.
Gonzaga, Cesare.
Gonzaga, Claudio.
Gonzaga, Ercole, cardinal.
Gonzaga, Federico, cardinal.
Gonzaga, Ferrante.
Gonzaga, Francesco, cardinal.
Gonzaga, Giovan Vincenzo, cardinal.
Gonzaga, Vespasiano.
Gonzaga, Vincenzo.
Gonzaga Colonna, Giulia.
Gonzaga Della Rovere, Eleonora.

González de Mendoza, Pedro.
Gori, Fabio.
Gori, Francesca.
Gotor, Miguel.
Gotti, Aurelio.
Gottsmann, Andreas.
Gozzadini, Ulisse.
Granada, Luis de, see Luis de Granada.
Grandi, Giulio.
Granelli, Giovan Battista.
Granelli, Matteo.
Granvelle, see Perrenot de Granvelle.
Grassi, Annibale.
Grassi, Giovanni Antonio.
Grati, Giacomo.
Graziani, Giacomo.
Grechetto, see Zannettini, Dionigi, known as Grechetto.
Greco, Aulo.
Greengrass, Mark.
Gregorio XIII (Ugo Boncompagni), pope (1572-1585).
Gregorio di Nazianzo, saint.
Gregorowicz, Dorota.
Grendi, Edoardo.
Grendler, Paul F.
Grifoni, Ugolino.
Grillenzoni, family.
Grillenzoni, Antonio.
Grillenzoni, Bartolomeo.
Grillenzoni, Francesco.
Grillenzoni, Giovanni.
Grillo, Paolo.
Grimani, family.
Grimani, Domenico, cardinal.
Grimani, Giovanni.
Grimani, Marco.
Grimani, Marino, cardinal.
Grisar, Joseph.
Griseri, Giuseppe.
Grisonio, Annibale.
Groppe, Kaspar.
Gropper, Johannes, cardinal.
Grossi, Ada.
Grossi, Giovan Battista.
Gualano, Ranieri.
Gualteruzzi, Carlo.
Gualteruzzi, Ugolino.
Gualtieri, Sebastiano.
Guasco, Maurilio.
Guastalla, countess of, see Torelli, Ludovica.
Guastavillani, Filippo, cardinal.
Guasto (Vasto), marquis of, see Avalos, Alfonso d’.
Guerra, Alessandro.
Guerrea, Juan.
Guerrero, Pedro.
Guerrieri Borsoi, Maria Barbara.
Guggisberg, Hans R.

Guglielmo II Gonzaga, duke of Mantua.
Guglielmo V di Wittelsbach, duke of Bavaria.
Guglielmotti, Alberto.
Gui, Francesco.
Guicciardini, Francesco.
Guicciardini, Pietro.
Guidi, Antonio.
Guidiccioni, Bartolomeo, cardinal.
Guido da Fano, see Giannetti, Guido.
Guidoni, Cosimo.
Guidoni, Guidotto.
Guidoni, Sisto.
Guidotti, Giulio Cesare.
Guidubaldo II Della Rovere, duke of Urbino.
Guisa (Guise), family.
Guisa, Carlo di, cardinal.
Guisa, Francesco di, duke of Lorraine.
Gutiérrez, David.
Hamilton, Alastair.
Hansen, Joseph.
Harding, Thomas.
Harris, Steven J.
Harry, John.
Haug, Tilman.
Haugaard, William.
Headley, John M.
Heiding, Fredrik.
Henshaw, Henry.
Herbers, Klaus.
Hernando Sánchez, Carlos José.
Hewett, A. Edith.
Hilliger, Benno.
Hinojosa, marquis of La Hinojosa, see Mendoza y Velasco, Juan de la.
Hinojosa, Ricardo de.
Hirst, Michael.
Hohenzollern, Alberto di, cardinal.
Hohenzollern, Gioacchino II di, see Gioacchino II di Hohenzollern, elector of Brandenburg.
Hollingsworth, Mary.
Hosjusz, Stanisław, cardinal.
Hudon, William V.
Hünermann, Friedrich.
Hurtado de Mendoza, Diego.
Hurtado de Mendoza, Francisco.
Hurtubise, Pierre.
Iacovella, Marco.
Iaio, Claudio, see Le Jay, Claude.
Iancis, Paolo.
Iarocci, Irene.
Idiáquez y Olazábal, Juan de.
Ignazio di Loyola, saint.
Inghilterra, cardinal of, see Pole, Reginald.
Inghilterra, queen of, see Maria Tudor d’Asburgo.
Ingoni, Bartolomeo.
Innocenzo VIII (Giovanni Battista Cibo), pope (1484-1492).
Innocenzo IX (Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti), pope (1591).
Intra, Giovan Battista.

Ippolito da Correggio, see Correggio, Ippolito da.
Isaia, prophet.
Isenburg, Salentino VII.
Iserloh, Erwin.
Israel, Uwe.
Italiano, Gianmario.
Ivan IV, known as the Terrible, tsar of Russia (1547-1584).
Jacobson Schutte, Anne.
Jagellone, family.
Jagellone Báthory, Anna, queen of Poland.
Jaitner, Klaus.
Jankowiak, François.
Janssen, Geert H.
Jedin, Hubert.
Jiménez Pablo, Esther.
Joannides, Paul.
Kalkoff, Paul.
Kamen, Henry.
Karnkowski, Stanisław.
Kausler, Eduard von.
Kennedy, Frank T.
Khayr ad-Dīn, known as Barbarossa.
Klingenstein, Grete.
Kluckhohn, August.
Koller, Alexander.
Köpfel (Capitone), Wolfgang.
Krasenbrink, Josef von.
Krodel, Gottfried.
Kromer, Marcin.
Kuen-Belasy, Johann Jakob von.
Kusch, Britta.
Lachi, Matteo.
Laderchi, Giacomo.
Laemmer, Hugo.
Laínez, Giacomo.
Lalande, Joseph-Jérôme.
La Marca, Nicola.
Lanciani, Rodolfo.
Lanciano, archbishop of, see Marini, Leonardo.
Lancillotti, Tommasino de' Bianchi, known as Lancillotti.
Lanckorońska, Carolina.
Landi, Fiorenzo.
Landino, Silvestro.
Lando, Ortensio.
Landriani, Gasparo.
Lanssac, Louis de.
Lanzoni, Silvio.
Larivaille, Paul.
Latoch, Ladislas.
Laurerio, Dionigi, cardinal.
Lauri, Loreto.
Lauro, Pietro.
Lauro, Vincenzo.
Laven, Mary.
Laven, Peter J.
Lazzerini, Luigi.

Le Bachelet, Xavier-Marie.
Lefèvre, Renato.
Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques.
Le Jay, Claude.
Lemaître, Nicole.
Le Myre, Lupin.
Lénoncourt, Robert de, cardinal.
Lenzi, Lorenzo.
Léonard, Émile.
Leone III, pope (795-816), saint.
Leone X (Giovanni de' Medici), pope (1513-1521).
Leoni, Leone.
Lercari, Andrea.
Lercari, Giovan Battista.
Lercari, Stefano.
Lesmo, Bernardo.
Lestringant, Frank.
Levati, Stefano.
Lewis, Owen.
Leydi, Silvio.
Leyva, Antonio de.
Lienhard-Riva, Alfredo.
Linguardo, Francesco.
Lino, Gaspare dal.
Lippi, Filippino.
Lippomano, Alvise.
Lisia Fileno, see Renato, Camillo.
Lizzeri, Buono (Omobono).
Loades, David Michael.
Loarte, Gaspare.
Locatelli, Eustachio.
Lodi, Enzo.
Lomazzo, Giovan Paolo.
Lombardo, Antonio.
Lombardo, Cristoforo, known as Lombardino.
Longo, Pier Giorgio.
Lopez, Pasquale.
López Martín, Juan.
López Pacheco, Diego.
Lo Re, Salvatore.
Lorena, cardinal of, see Guisa, Carlo di.
Lorenzo the Magnificent, see Medici, Lorenzo de'.
Lossen, Max.
Lottini, Giovanfrancesco.
Lotto, Lorenzo.
Louthan, Howard.
Lowe, Kate.
Loyola, Ignazio di, see Ignazio di Loyola, saint.
Lucas, Thomas M.
Lucioni, Alfredo.
Ludovico, archpriest of San Felice sul Panaro.
Ludovico da Canossa.
Ludovico da Fossombrone.
Ludovico the Moor, see Sforza, Ludovico Maria.
Lugioyo, Brian.
Luigi XII di Valois, king of France (1498-1515).

Luis de Granada.
Luna, Claudio de (count of Luna), see Fernández de Quiñones, Claudio.
Lunardi, Fileno.
Lupi, Maria.
Lutero, Martino.
Luttenberger, Albrecht P.
Lutz, Heinrich.
Luzio, Alessandro.
Luzzara, Camilo.
Luzzati, Michele.
Luzzatto, Sergio.
Machella, Niccolò.
Machiavelli, Niccolò.
Machiavelli, Pirro.
Machiavelli, Pompeo.
Machiavelli, Vittorio.
Mackensen, Heinz.
Maddalena, saint, see Maria Maddalena, saint.
Madruzzo, Cristoforo, cardinal.
Madruzzo, Ludovico, cardinal.
Maffei, Alessandro.
Maffei, Bernardino, cardinal.
Maffei, Domenico.
Maffei, Paola.
Maggi, Francesco Maria.
Maghenzani, Simone.
Magnavacca, Marco.
Maifreda, Germano.
Mainardi, Agostino.
Mainetti, Sebastiano.
Maino, family.
Maino, Giasone del.
Malatesta, Galeotto.
Malatesta, Giacomo.
Maldozzi, Pietro Antonio.
Malombra, Pietro.
Malvezzi, Ercole.
Mancino, Michele.
Manconi, Francesco.
Mandelli, Vittorio.
Manelfi, Pietro.
Maniscalco Basile, Giovanni.
Manrique, Tomás.
Manrique de Lara, Juan.
Mantova, cardinal of, see Gonzaga, Ercole.
Mantova, duke of, see Francesco III Gonzaga.
Mantova, duke of, see Guglielmo II Gonzaga.
Mantovani, Vincenzo.
Manuzio, Aldo.
Manuzio, Paolo.
Manzoli, Ercole.
Manzoli, Francesco.
Manzoli, Giovanni Andrea.
Mara Desilva, Jennifer.
Maranello, see Tagliadi, Giovanni Maria, known as Maranello.
Marcantonio da Casale.

Marcatto, Dario.
Marceau, Bertrand.
Marcello II (Marcello Cervini), pope (1555).
Marchese, Pietro.
Marchetti, Elisabetta.
Marchetti, Valerio.
Marcocchi, Massimo.
Marcora, Carlo.
Marescalchi, Giovanni Battista.
Marforio.
Margherita di Angoulême, queen of Navarre.
Margherita d'Austria, see Asburgo de' Medici (later Farnese), Margherita.
Maria Stuart, queen of Scotland.
Maria Tudor d'Asburgo, queen of England.
Maria d'Ungheria, see Ungheria d'Asburgo, Maria d'.
Maria Maddalena, saint.
Mariana, Juan de.
Marignano, marquis of, see Medici, Gian Giacomo de'.
Marín Ocete, Antonio.
Marini, Leonardo.
Marini, Luigi Gaetano.
Marino, John A.
Mario, Paolo.
Mariotti, Antonio.
Márquez, Antonio.
Marshall, Peter.
Martelli, Braccio.
Martenet, Gabriel.
Martin, Craig.
Martin, Gregory.
Martin, John Jeffries.
Martinengo, Celso Massimiliano.
Martinengo, Girolamo.
Martínez de Bujanda, Jesús.
Martinis, Roberta.
Martino V (Oddone Colonna), pope (1417-1431).
Marucci, Valerio.
Maryks, Robert Aleksander.
Marzo, Antonio.
Masetti, Giulio.
Masini, Eliseo.
Masini, Paolo.
Masius, Andreas.
Massa, Antonio.
Massarelli, Angelo.
Massimiliano I d'Asburgo, emperor (1493-1519).
Massimiliano II d'Asburgo, emperor (1564-1576).
Massimiliano Ercole Sforza, duke of Milan.
Matheson, Peter.
Matheus, Michael.
Matteo, saint.
Matteo da Bascio.
Mattone, Antonello.
Maturo, Bartolomeo.
Maurenbrecher, Wilhelm.
Mayer, Sebaldus.

Mayer, Thomas F.
Mayr, Gundula.
Mazzarelli, Giuliano.
Mazzone, Umberto.
Mazzoni, Ludovico.
McClung Hallman, Barbara.
McCoog, Thomas M.
McCuaig,William.
McCulloch, Diarmaid.
McGinness, Frederick J.
McNair, Philip.
Méchoulan, Henry.
Medeghino, see Medici, Gian Giacomo de', known as Medeghino.
Medici de', family.
Medici, Alessandro de', see Alessandro de' Medici, duke of Florence.
Medici, Bernardino de'.
Medici, Bernardo de'.
Medici, Cosimo de', see Cosimo de' Medici, duke of Florence, later grand duke of Tuscany.
Medici, Ferdinando de', see Ferdinando I de' Medici, cardinal, later grand duke of Tuscany.
Medici, Francesco de', see Francesco I de' Medici, grand duke of Tuscany.
Medici, Gian Angelo de', see Pio IV, pope.
Medici, Gian Giacomo de'.
Medici, Giovan Battista de'.
Medici, Giovanni de', cardinal.
Medici, Giulio de', cardinal, see Clemente VII, pope.
Medici, Ippolito de', cardinal.
Medici, Lorenzino de'.
Medici, Lorenzo de', known as the Magnificent.
Medici di Marignano de', family.
Medici Orsini, Isabella de'.
Medici Valois, Caterina de', queen of France.
Medighini, Ludovico.
Meier, Johannes.
Melantone, Filippo.
Mellano, Maria Franca.
Melso, Paolo.
Melville, Gert.
Memmo, Giovan Maria.
Menant, François.
Mendoza, Diego de, see Hurtado de Mendoza, Diego de.
Mendoza y Bobadilla, Francisco de', cardinal.
Mendoza y Velasco, Juan, marquis of La Hinojosa.
Menes Silva, Amadeo de.
Meneses, Juan de.
Menniti Ippolito, Antonio.
Menozzi, Daniele.
Mentuati (Mentovati), Camillo.
Meravigli, family.
Mercati, Angelo.
Mercatili Indelicato, Elide.
Mercuriano, Everardo.
Merenda, Apollonio.
Meriggi, Marco.
Merlin, Pierpaolo.
Merlo, Enrica Z.
Merlo, Grado G.

Meschiari, Giovanni Battista.
Meschini, Stefano.
Mesini, Candido.
Meuthen, Erich.
Meyer, Arnold Oskar.
Miccoli, Giovanni.
Michelangelo, see Buonarroti, Michelangelo.
Michele, archangel.
Michelson, Emily.
Miele, Michele.
Miglio, Massimo.
Miglioli, Alberto.
Mignanelli, Fabio, cardinal.
Milani, Alessandro.
Milano, duke of, see Francesco II Sforza.
Milano, Attilio.
Miletti, Marco Nicola.
Minucci, Minuccio.
Minuziano, Alessandro.
Miola, Robert S.
Missanelli, Nicola Francesco.
Mocenigo, Alvise.
Modena, bishop of, see Foscarari, Egidio.
Modigliani, Anna.
Molini, Giuseppe.
Molnár, Antal.
Molza, family.
Molza, Camillo.
Mongiano, Elisa.
Mongini, Guido.
Monsignorin, see Visconti, Ettore, known as Monsignorin.
Monson, Craig A.
Montaigne, Michel de.
Montalcino, see Buzio, Giovanni, known as Montalcino.
Montalto, Lina.
Montecchio, Pietro.
Monteceneri, Andrea.
Montesa, Fernando de.
Montesinos, José F.
Monti, Gennaro Maria.
Montmorency, Anne de.
Morandi, Giambattista.
Morando, Domenico.
Moréri, Louis.
Moreschi, Fioravanti.
Moresco, Roberto.
Morigia, Paolo.
Morillo, Juan.
Morillon, Maximilien.
Morisi Guerra, Anna.
Morone, family.
Morone, Antonio (di Bartolomeo).
Morone, Antonio (Giovanni Antonio) (di Girolamo).
Morone, Antonio (di Giulio).
Morone, Bartolomeo.
Morone, Cesare.

Morone, Filippo.
Morone, Galeazzo.
Morone, Giacomo.
Morone, Giacomo Antonio.
Morone, Giangirolamo.
Morone, Giovanni (di Bartolomeo).
Morone, Giovanni (di Girolamo).
Morone, Giovanni Antonio, see Morone Antonio (di Girolamo).
Morone, Giovanni Bartolomeo.
Morone, Giovanni Carlo.
Morone, Giovanni Tommaso.
Morone, Girolamo (di Bartolomeo).
Morone, Girolamo (di Massimiliano).
Morone, Girolamo (di Sforza).
Morone, Giulio.
Morone, Ludovico.
Morone, Massimiliano.
Morone, Orazio.
Morone, Paolo.
Morone, Policarpo.
Morone, Sforza.
Morone, Taddeo.
Morone, Tommaso.
Morone Botta (later Vialardi), Eleonora.
Morone Corio, Susanna.
Morone Gallarati, Amabilia.
Morone Morone, Lucia.
Morone Pallavicino, Angela.
Morone Stampa, family.
Morone Stampa, Anna.
Morone Taverna, Anna.
Morone Visconti, Chiara.
Moronessa, Iacopo.
Moroni, family.
Moroni, Gaetano.
Moroni, Marco.
Moroni, Ornella.
Moroni Stampa, Giorgio.
Moroni Stampa, Giovanna.
Morra, Girolamo.
Morton, Nicholas.
Morvillier, Jean de.
Mosco, see Ivan IV, known as the Terrible, tsar of Russia.
Motta, Franco.
Motta, Giuseppe.
Mozzarelli, Cesare.
Mozzato, Pietro.
Mucanzio, Francesco.
Mühlen, Karl-Heinz zur.
Müller, Giuseppe.
Müller, Theodor.
Münster, Sebastian.
Murphy, Francesca Aran.
Murphy, Paul V.
Musotti, Alessandro.
Musso, Cornelio.

Mutinelli, Fabio.
Muzio, Girolamo.
Muzzarelli, Girolamo.
Muzzarelli, Maria Giuseppina.
Nabucodonosor II, king of Babylon.
Nacchianti, Iacopo.
Nadal, Girolamo.
Nagel, Alexander.
Napoleone I Bonaparte, emperor of the French (1804-1815).
Napoli, cardinal of, see Carafa, Alfonso.
Napoli, cardinal of (Gian Pietro Carafa), see Paolo IV, pope.
Narno, saint.
Natale, Mauro.
Nausea, Friedrich.
Navagero, Bernardo, cardinal.
Negri, Francesco.
Negri, Giovan Francesco.
Negri, Girolamo.
Negri, Paola Antonia (Virginia).
Negrone, Girolamo.
Nencioni, Giovanni.
Neri, Daniela.
Neri, Enzo.
Neri, Filippo, see Filippo Neri, saint.
Nerli, Reginaldo.
Niccoli, Ottavia.
Niccolò V (Tommaso Parentucelli), pope (1447-1455).
Niccolò del Finale.
Nice, Jason.
Nicolau, Michael.
Nieto, José C.
Nieto, Tommaso.
Niklas, Thomas.
Ninguarda, Feliciano.
Ninnes, Richard J.
Noailles, François de.
Noè.
Nores, Pietro.
Novembri, Valeria.
Nubola, Cecilia.
Nussdorfer, Laurie.
Oberholzer, Paul.
Occhipinti, Carmelo.
Ochino, Bernardino.
Oddoni, Giovanni Angelo.
Odescalchi, family.
Odescalchi, Paolo.
Oldani, family.
Oldenburg Sforza, Cristina di, duchess of Milan.
Oldoini, Agostino.
Olgiati, Bernardo.
Olin, John C.
Olivieri, Achille.
Olivieri, Agostino.
Olivo, Camillo.
Olmi, Giuseppe.

Olocati, Alessandro.
O'Malley, John W.
Omobono da Cremona, see Lizzeri, Buono (Omobono).
Omodei, family.
Omodei Morone, Caterina.
O'Neill, Charles E.
Onorio III (Cencio Savelli), pope (1216-1227).
Oraboni, Giovenale.
O'Reilly, Clare.
Orio, Ippolito.
Ormanetto, Niccolò.
Ormisda, pope (514-523), saint.
Orsini, family.
Orsini, Camillo.
Orsini, Flavio, cardinal.
Orsini de' Medici, Marzia.
Ortolani, Oddone.
Osmond, Patricia.
Osorio de Vega, Leonora.
Ossola, Carlo.
Otranto, archbishop of, see Di Capua, Pietro Antonio.
Ottavio Farnese, duke of Camerino, later of Parma and Piacenza.
Overell, Anne.
Pacheco Ladrón de Guevara, Pedro, cardinal.
Pacheco de Villena, Francisco, cardinal.
Pacini, Arturo.
Padovani, Giovanni.
Padovano, Giovanni, bookseller.
Padovano, Giovanni.
Paganelli, Bartolomeo.
Pagano, Sergio.
Palatinato, elector of, see Federico III, known as the Pious.
Paleario, Aonio.
Paleologo, Iacopo.
Paleotti, Astorre.
Paleotti, Camillo.
Paleotti, Gabriele, cardinal.
Palermo, Daniele.
Palescandolo, Matteo.
Pallantieri, Alessandro.
Pallantieri, Pompeo.
Pallavicino, Adalberto.
Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza, cardinal.
Palmerio, Giancarlo.
Pampalone, Antonella.
Pancaldi, Lorenzo.
Pancheri, Roberto.
Panciatichi, Bartolomeo.
Panigarola, family.
Panigarola, Gregorio.
Panigarola, Margherita (Arcangela).
Panighetti, Virginia.
Panizza, Gian Maria.
Panizza, Teodosio.
Pantaleon, Heinrich.
Panvinio, Onofrio.

Paolin, Giovanna.
Paolini, Lorenzo.
Paolo da Campogalliano.
Paolo di Tarso, saint 156.
Paolo III (Alessandro Farnese), pope (1534-1549).
Paolo IV (Gian Pietro Carafa), pope (1555-1559).
Paolo V (Camillo Borghese), pope (1605-1621).
Papino, Girolamo.
Parente, Ulderico.
Paris, Alessandro.
Parisetto, Girolamo.
Parisio, Pier Paolo, cardinal.
Parker, Charles.
Parks, George B.
Parlato, Enrico.
Parpaglia, Vincenzo.
Parravicino, Giovanni Giorgio.
Partner, Peter.
Paschini, Pio.
Pasquali, Marta.
Pasquino.
Pastor, Ludwig von.
Pastore, Alessandro.
Pastore, Stefania.
Patanella, Marcantonio.
Patrizi, Elisabetta.
Patrizio, saint.
Pattenden, Miles.
Pavia, bishop of, see Rossi, Giovangirolamo de'.
Pavone, Sabina.
Paz y Meliá, Antonio.
Pazzani, Barbara.
Pazzani, Bartolomeo.
Pazzani, Giulio Cesare.
Pecorari, Paolo.
Pedrini, Riccardo.
Pedro de Toledo, see Álvarez de Toledo.
Pedroche, Tomás.
Pedullà, Gabriele.
Pelagio, saint.
Pellegrino, Nicoletta.
Pelletier, Jean.
Pellevé, Nicolas de, cardinal.
Pelliccia, Guerrino.
Pellikan, Konrad.
Pellotti, Bernardino, known as Garapina.
Peña, Francisco.
Pepoli, Filippo.
Perbono, Gerolamo.
Perelli, Sano.
Peretti, Felice, cardinal, see Sisto V, pope.
Pérez, Giovan Battista.
Pérez, Gonzalo.
Pergola, Bartolomeo della, see Bartolomeo della Pergola.
Perini, Leandro.
Perna, Pietro.

Pero, see Gelido, Pietro, known as Pero.
Perrenot de Granvelle, Antoine, cardinal.
Perrenot de Granvelle, Nicolas.
Peruzzi, Angelo.
Pescara, marchioness of, see Colonna d'Avalos, Vittoria.
Pescara, marquis of, see Avalos, Francesco Ferdinando d'.
Petow, William, cardinal.
Petrarca, Francesco.
Petrella, Giancarlo.
Petronio, saint.
Petronio, Ugo.
Petrucci, Franca.
Pettinaroli, Laura.
Peyronel Rambaldi, Susanna.
Pezzella, Sosio.
Pia, Bernardino.
Pianton, Pietro.
Piasti, family.
Piatesi, Ercole.
Piatti, Girolamo.
Piatti, Pierantonio.
Pico, Giambattista.
Pico Rangoni, Lucrezia.
Pierce, Robert A.
Piergiovanni, Vito.
Pierling, Paul.
Pier Luigi Farnese, duke of Parma and Piacenza.
Pieri, Piero.
Pietramellara, Giovanni Antonio.
Pietro, saint.
Pietro Canisio (Pieter Kanijs), saint.
Pietro (Martire) da Verona, saint.
Pietro Antonio da Cervia.
Piga, Claudio.
Pighino, Sebastiano, cardinal.
Pili, Giovanni.
Pino González, Eduardo del.
Pio IV (Gian Angelo Medici), pope (1559-1565).
Pio V (Michele Ghislieri), pope (1566-1572), saint.
Pio da Carpi, family.
Pio da Carpi, Lionello II.
Pio da Carpi, Marco II.
Pio da Carpi, Rodolfo, cardinal.
Pio da Carpi Sanseverino, Margherita.
Piot, Charles.
Pippi, Giulio.
Pisa, cardinal of, see Rebiba, Scipione.
Pisani, Francesco, cardinal.
Pischedda, Katia.
Pissavino, Paolo Costantino.
Pistoni, Giuseppe.
Pizzorno, Diego.
Pizzorusso, Giovanni.
Platina, see Sacchi, Bartolomeo, known as Platina.
Platone.
Poe, Marshall.

Poetschke, Joachim.
Poggiano, Giulio.
Poggio, Giovanni, cardinal.
Polanco, Juan Alfonso de.
Pole, Reginald, cardinal.
Politi, Ambrogio Catarino.
Poncet, Olivier.
Pontano, Girolamo.
Pontano, Guglielmo.
Pontecurone, Bernardino.
Pontieri, Ernesto.
Pontormo, Iacopo.
Ponzone, Pietro Martire.
Popkin, Richard H.
Porcelaga, Aurelio.
Porcia, Bartolomeo.
Portico, Vincenzo dal.
Pörtner, Regina.
Porto, Francesco.
Portogallo, cardinal of, see Enrico I di Aviz, cardinal, later king of Portugal.
Possevino, Antonio.
Postina, Alois.
Poullet, Edmond.
Poussou, Jean-Pierre.
Praga, archbishop of, see Brus z Mohelnice, Antonín.
Premoli, Orazio.
Prepositi, Francesco.
Presa, Alessandra.
Prezzolini, Carlo.
Price Zimmermann, Thomas C.
Primerano, Domenica.
Priuli, Alvise.
Priuli, Matteo.
Procaccioli, Paolo.
Prodi, Paolo.
Promis, Domenico.
Prosperi, Adriano.
Prospero, Bartolomeo.
Pulzone, Scipione.
Puncuh, Dino.
Pupeto, Rocco.
Pusterla, Pietro.
Puteo, Giacomo, cardinal.
Quaglioni, Diego.
Quaranta, Chiara.
Quazza, Romolo.
Quirini, Angelo Maria, cardinal.
Quirini, Vincenzo, cardinal.
Quondam, Amedeo.
Rabia, family.
Racheli, Antonio.
Radziwiłł, Mikołaj.
Raffaelli, Renato.
Ragagli, Simone.
Ragazzoni, Girolamo.
Ragone, Raffaella.

Ragusa, archbishop of, see Beccadelli, Ludovico.
Rainini, Marco.
Rambaldi, Giuseppe.
Rame, Elena.
Ramírez, Juan.
Rampino, Marco.
Rangoni, Claudio.
Rangoni, Ercole.
Rangoni, Fulvio.
Rangoni, Giovanni.
Rangoni, Guido.
Rangoni, Lucrezia, see Pico Rangoni, Lucrezia.
Rangoni, Venceslao.
Rangoni Stampa, Isabella.
Ranieri, Concetta.
Ranke, Leopold von.
Raponi, Nicola.
Ravenna, cardinal of, see Accolti, Benedetto.
Raverta, Ottaviano.
Ravizza, Giuseppe.
Rebiba, Scipione, cardinal.
Rebucci, Maria Teresa.
Recalcati, Ambrogio.
Redigonda, Abele L.
Rehberg, Andreas E.
Reinhard, Wolfgang.
Reinhardt, Volker.
Renata di Francia, see Valois d'Este, Renata, duchess of Ferrara.
Renato, Camillo.
Renato, Eusebio.
Repgen, Konrad.
Repishti, Francesco.
Requesens y Zúñiga, Luis de.
Restif, Bruno.
Reumano Giovanni (Jean Suau), cardinal.
Rezzaghi, Roberto.
Rhegius, Urbanus.
Rhetius, Johannes.
Ribadeneira, Pedro de.
Ribier, Guillaume.
Ricasoli, Giovan Battista.
Ricci, Giovanni, cardinal.
Ricci, Giuliano de'.
Ricci, Saverio.
Ricciarelli, Daniele, see Daniele da Volterra.
Riccio, Pier Francesco.
Ricciulli dal Fosso, Gaspare.
Richardson, Carol M.
Ridolfi, family.
Ridolfi, Niccolò, cardinal.
Ridolfi, Pierluigi.
Rill, Gerhard.
Rimoldi, Antonio.
Rinaldi, Antonio.
Rinaldi, Odorico.
Rinieri, Giacomo.

Rirton, Thomas.
Ristori, Renzo.
Rita, Andreina.
Ritter, Saverio.
Rivoire, Enrico Alberto.
Robertet, Florimond.
Roberto Bellarmino, saint.
Robertson, Clare.
Robinson, Adam Patrick.
Roca Cabanellas, Miguel.
Rocca, Alberto.
Rocca, Giancarlo.
Rocciolo, Domenico.
Rodolfo II d'Asburgo, emperor (1576-1612).
Rodolfo, Alessandra.
Rodríguez, Cristoforo.
Rolandi, Sebastiano.
Rolle, Claudio.
Romani, Vittoria.
Romano, Angelo.
Romano, Davide.
Romano, Ruggiero.
Romei, Giovanna.
Romeo, Francesco (da Castiglione).
Romeo, Giovanni.
Romeo, Sebastiano.
Ronchini, Amadio.
Rosa, Mario.
Rosario, Virgilio, cardinal.
Roseo, Mambrino.
Rosi, Michele.
Rosselli, Donatella.
Rossetti, Alfonso.
Rossetti, Edoardo.
Rossi, Arcangelo.
Rossi, Buonaventura de'.
Rossi, Giancarlo.
Rossi, Giovangirolamo de'.
Rossi, Girolamo.
Roth, Adalbert.
Rotondò, Antonio.
Rovelli, Donato.
Rovelli, Girolamo.
Rozzo, Ugo.
Rucellai, family.
Ruggeri, Angelo.
Ruggeri, Bonifacio.
Ruggeri, Giulio.
Ruiz de Alcaraz, Pedro.
Rullo, Donato.
Rurale, Flavio.
Rusconi, Roberto.
Russell, Rinaldina.
Russo, Giuseppe.
Rustico, saint.
Rusticucci, Girolamo, cardinal.

Rutenburg, Viktor Ivanovič.
Sabatini, Gaetano.
Sabene, Renata.
Sacchi, Bartolomeo, known as Platina.
Sacchi, Rossana.
Sachet, Paolo.
Sackville, Richard.
Sackville, Thomas.
Sadoleto, Alfonso.
Sadoleto, Giulio.
Sadoleto, Iacopo, cardinal.
Sadoleto, Paolo.
Safley, Thomas Max.
Sagone, bishop of, see Federici, Girolamo.
Salamanca, bishop of, see González de Mendoza, Pedro.
Salazar, Philippe-Joseph.
Salerno, archbishop of, see Seripando, Girolamo, cardinal.
Salmerón, Alfonso.
Salomone, king of Israel.
Saltini, Guglielmo Enrico.
Salvatico, Giovanni Angelo.
Salvetto, Paolo.
Salviati, family.
Salviati, Anton Maria.
Salviati, Bernardo, cardinal.
Salviati, Giovanni, cardinal.
Salza, Abd-el-Kader.
Samaritani, Antonio.
San Clemente, cardinal of, see Cicala, Giambattista.
Sanders, Nicholas.
Sandonnini, Tommaso.
Sanfelice, Giovanni Tommaso.
Sanfilippo, Matteo.
Sangalli, Maurizio.
San Giacomo (di Compostella), cardinal of, see Álvarez de Toledo, Juan.
Sanseverino, family.
Sanseverino, Ferrante.
Santacroce, Prospero, cardinal.
Santa Fiora, cardinal of, see Sforza di Santa Fiora, Guido Ascanio.
Santarelli, Daniele.
Santa Severina, cardinal of, see Santoro, Giulio Antonio.
Santi, Bernardo.
Santiago, cardinal of, see Álvarez de Toledo, Juan.
Santiso, Anthony.
Santo da Mantova.
Santoro, Giulio Antonio, cardinal.
Santoro, Mario.
Santosuosso, Antonio.
Santus, Cesare.
Sanudo, Marin.
Sapegno, Maria Serena.
Sapori, Giuliana.
Saraceno, Giovanni Michele.
Sarpi, Paolo.
Sarti, Nicoletta.
Sassi, Panfilo.

Sassonia, elector of, see Augusto I Wettin.
Satana.
Saul, king of Israel.
Sauli, Domenico.
Savelli, Giacomo, cardinal.
Savelli, Rodolfo.
Savera, Martino.
Savi, Lorenzo.
Savoia, family.
Savoia, duke of, see Emanuele Filiberto di Savoia.
Savonarola, Girolamo.
Sbriccoli, Mario.
Scaduto, Mario.
Scannapeco, Girolamo.
Scaramella, Pierroberto.
Schallert, Regine.
Schatz, Klaus.
Scheib, Otto.
Schelhorn, Johann Georg.
Schellhass, Karl.
Schiera, Pierangelo.
Schiess, Traugott.
Schizzi, Giovan Battista.
Schmidt, Peter.
Schneider, Burkhart.
Schnettger, Matthias.
Schott, Theodor.
Schröder, Peter.
Schultze, Viktor.
Schwaiger, Georg.
Schwedt, Hermann H.
Schweitzer, Vinzenz.
Sclopis, Federico.
Scotti, Bernardino, cardinal.
Scotti, Giovan Battista.
Scotti, Tommaso, da Vigevano.
Scotti, Tommaso, see Gallarati Scotti, Tommaso.
Scrase, David.
Scullica, Teofilo.
Sebastiano I di Aviz, king of Portugal.
Secchiari, Francesco.
Seghizzi, Giulio Cesare.
Segre, Renata.
Seidel Menchi, Silvana.
Selden Rose, Robert.
Seletti, Emilio.
Senarega, Matteo.
Sens, archbishop and cardinal of, see Pellevé, Nicolas de.
Serafino da Fermo, see Aceti de' Porti, Serafino.
Serbelloni, Gabrio.
Serbelloni, Giovanni Antonio, cardinal.
Sereno, Bartolomeo.
Seripando, Girolamo, cardinal.
Sermoneta, cardinal, see Caetani di Sermoneta, Nicola.
Sernini, Nino.
Serrano, Luciano.

Serristori, Averardo.
Sertori, family.
Servet, Miguel.
Sessa, duke of, see Fernández de Córdoba, Gonzalo.
Sessa Aurunca, bishop of, see Florimonte, Galeazzo.
Seton, John.
Settis, Salvatore.
Sfondrati, Francesco, cardinal.
Sforza, family.
Sforza, Francesco (di Ludovico Maria), see Francesco II Sforza, duke of Milan.
Sforza, Francesco (di Muzio Attendolo), see Francesco I Sforza, duke of Milan.
Sforza, Ludovico Maria, known as the Moor.
Sforza, Massimiliano Ercole, see Massimiliano Ercole Sforza, duke of Milan.
Sforza di Santa Fiora, Bosio II.
Sforza di Santa Fiora, Faustina.
Sforza di Santa Fiora, Guido Ascanio, cardinal.
Shakespeare, William.
Shaw, Christine.
Siculo, Giorgio.
Sighizzi, Francesco.
Sigibaldi, Gian Domenico.
Sigismondo II Augusto Jagellone, king of Poland (1548.1572).
Sigismondo III Wasa, king of Poland and Sweden (1587-1632).
Signorotto, Gianvittorio.
Sigonio, Carlo.
Silenzi, Ferdinando.
Silenzi, Renato.
Silingardi, Gasparo.
Silos, Giuseppe.
Silvano, Giovanni.
Silvestri, Rodolfo.
Simoncelli, Paolo.
Simonetta, Giacomo, cardinal.
Simonetta, Ludovico, cardinal.
Simonetta, Scipione.
Siraisi, Nancy G.
Sirenio, Giulio.
Sirleto, Guglielmo, cardinal.
Sironi, Beatrice.
Sisto V (Felice Peretti), pope (1585-1590).
Sisto da Bologna.
Sittich von Hohenems (Altemps), family.
Sittich von Hohenems (Altemps), Marco, cardinal.
Sol, Eugène.
Solfaroli Camillocci, Daniela.
Solimano I, the Magnificent, sultan of the Ottoman Empire (1520-1566).
Solmi, Edmondo.
Somaini, Francesco.
Sommi, Alberico.
Soncino, marchioness of, see Morone Stampa, Anna.
Soranzo, Giacomo.
Soranzo, Giovanni.
Soranzo, Girolamo.
Soranzo, Vittore.
Soto, Domingo de.
Souchier, Jérôme, cardinal.

Sozzini, Lelio.
Spagna, Angelo.
Spantigati, Carla Enrica.
Spinola, Agostino.
Spinola, Giovan Battista.
Spinola, Publio Francesco.
Spiritello, Giovan Battista.
Stadion, Christoph von.
Stagno, Aurelio.
Stampa, family.
Stampa, Donato.
Stampa, Ermes.
Stampa, Francesco.
Stampa, Massimiliano.
Starenko, Peter E.
Stefano, saint.
Stefano I Báthory, voivode of Transylvania, later king of Poland (1576-1586).
Steinberg, Leo.
Stella, Aldo.
Stella, Bartolomeo.
Stella, Giovan Francesco.
Stella, Tommaso, known as Todeschino.
Stella, Vincenzo.
Stiatici, Alessandro.
Stow, Kenneth.
Strozzi, family.
Strozzi, Battistino.
Strozzi, Matteo.
Strozzi, Pompeo.
Sturm, Johannes.
Suau, Jean, cardinal, see Reumano, Giovanni.
Suquía, Ángel.
Surian, Michele.
Susio, Giambattista.
Šusta, Josef.
Sutter Fichtner, Paula.
Szczucki, Lech.
Szepessy, Tibor.
Tabacchi, Stefano.
Tabo, Antonio.
Tacchella, Lorenzo.
Tacchi Venturi, Pietro.
Tagliadi, Giovanni Maria, known as Maranello.
Tailer, Edward.
Tallon, Alain.
Tamburino, Geminiano.
Tamponi, Rosa.
Targoff, Ramie.
Tasso, Faustino.
Tassoni, Alessandro.
Taverna, Francesco.
Taviani, Carlo.
Taxis, Giovanni Antonio von.
Teatino, cardinal (Gian Pietro Carafa), see Paolo IV, pope.
Tedeschi, John.
Teggia, Girolamo.

Tellechea Idígoras, José Ignacio.
Terpstra, Nicholas.
Terrazzano, Giovanni.
Testa, Luca.
Thomas, Andrew L.
Thompson, Nicholas J.
Thou, Jacques-Auguste de.
Throckmorton, Nicholas.
Thurm, Franz von.
Thyraeus, Hermann.
Tibaldeschi, Giorgio.
Tibaldi, Pellegrino.
Tiepolo, Paolo.
Tierney, Mark Aloysius.
Tinelli, Girolamo.
Tiraboschi, Girolamo.
Tiranni, Felice.
Tirolo, archduke of, see Asburgo, Ferdinando d'.
Tizzano, Lorenzo.
Todeschi, Cherubino.
Todeschino, see Stella, Tommaso, known as Todeschino.
Toffoli, Aldo.
Toledo, archbishop of, see Carranza, Bartolomé.
Toledo, cardinal of, see Álvarez de Toledo, Juan.
Toledo, Francisco de.
Toledo, Pedro de, see Álvarez de Toledo, Pedro.
Toledo Herrera, Francisco de, cardinal.
Tolnay, Charles de.
Tolomei, Fulvio.
Tomaro, John B.
Tomea, Paolo.
Tommaso d'Aquino, saint.
Tommaso Becket, saint.
Tommaso da Vicenza.
Tonelli, Giovanna.
Torchio, Girolamo.
Tordi, Domenico.
Torelli, Lelio.
Torelli, Ludovica.
Torre, Angelo.
Torres, Luis de.
Toscani, family.
Tosini, Patrizia.
Town, Edward.
Trani, cardinal of, see De Cupis, Giovanni Domenico.
Trani, cardinal of, see Scotti, Bernardino.
Transilvano, see Stefano I Báthory, voivode of Transylvania, later king of Poland, known as Transilvano.
Trecco, Giovan Francesco.
Treherne, Matthew.
Trento, cardinal of, see Madruzzo, Cristoforo.
Trento, Jean-Baptiste.
Trimbocchi, family.
Trimbocchi, Dionigi.
Trivulzio, family.
Trivulzio, Agostino, cardinal.
Trombetta, family.

Truchsess von Waldburg, Otto, cardinal.
Truman, Ronald.
Tuninetti, Giuseppe.
Turchetto, see Filalete, Giorgio.
Turchini, Angelo.
Turnhill, William B.
Tusor, Péter.
Ubaldi, Baldo degli.
Uchański, Jakub.
Ughelli, Ferdinando.
Uguzzone, Giuliano.
Ungheria d'Asburgo, Maria d'.
Unterburger, Klaus.
Urbano VI (Bartolomeo Prignano), pope (1378-1389).
Urbano VII (Giovan Battista Castagna), pope (1590).
Urbino, duke of, see Guidubaldo II Della Rovere.
Urfé, Claude d'.
Usodimare, Stefano.
Usoz y Río, Luis.
Vaccaro, Luciano.
Valdés, Alfonso de.
Valdés, Juan de.
Valenti, Filippo.
Valentini, Angelo.
Valentini, Bonifacio.
Valentini, Filippo.
Valeri, Elena.
Valeri, Marchio.
Valle, Claudio de.
Valois, family.
Valois, Francesco di, duke of Alençon.
Valois d'Este, Renata, duchess of Ferrara.
Valois Farnese, Diana di.
Van Gulik, Wilhelm.
Vanni, Andrea.
Van Ruysbroc, Jan.
Varanini, Gian Maria.
Varchi, Benedetto.
Vareschi, Severino.
Varese, Ranieri.
Vargas, Francisco.
Vasari, Giorgio.
Vasto, marquis of, see Avalos, Alfonso d'.
Vázquez, Alberto.
Vázquez Sotelo, Adolfo.
Vega, Garcilaso de la.
Vega, Juan de.
Vela, Claudio.
Velasco Mendoza, Isabel, marchioness of La Hinojosa.
Vélez, marquis of Los Vélez, see Fajardo y Córdoba, Pedro, marquis of Los Vélez.
Venenti, Giacomo.
Venier, Marina.
Verallo, Girolamo, cardinal.
Vercelli, cardinal of, see Ferrero, Guido.
Verdura, Giovan Francesco.
Vergerio, Giovan Battista.

Vergerio, Pier Paolo.
Vermigli, Pietro Martire.
Verri, Gabriele.
Verri, Pietro.
Verzosa, Juan de.
Vialardi, Giovan Francesco.
Vida, Girolamo.
Vigeri Della Rovere, Marco.
Vigeri Della Rovere, Urbano.
Vignola, see Barozzi, Iacopo, known as Vignola.
Villa, Francesco.
Villamarina, Marcantonio.
Villani, Antonio.
Villani, Stefano.
Villanova, Giovanni.
Villari, Rosario.
Villarosa, Carlantonio di, see De Rosa, Carlo Antonio.
Villena, marquis of, see López Pacheco, Diego.
Villetti, Gabriella.
Villoslada, Ricardo G.
Vincenzi, Francesco Maria.
Vinta, Paolo.
Visbroc, Johannes.
Visceglia, Maria Antonietta.
Visconti, Alessandro (husband of Chiara Morone).
Visconti, Alessandro (historian).
Visconti, Barnabò.
Visconti, Camillo.
Visconti, Carlo, cardinal.
Visconti, Ettore.
Visconti, Filippo Maria.
Visconti, Galeazzo.
Visconti, Giorgio.
Visconti, Matteo.
Visdomini, Sisto.
Vismara, Paola.
Vitelli, Vitellozzo, cardinal.
Vitoria, Diego de.
Vitoria, Francisco de.
Vittori, Mariano.
Vivanti, Corrado.
Vizzani, Pompeo.
Volpi, Caterina.
Volta, Zanino.
Wallace, William E.
Walz, Angelo.
Waźbińsky, Zygmunt.
Weber, Nadir.
Weigel, Thomas.
Werrecore, Hermann Matthias.
Wickersham, Jane K.
Wied, Hermann von.
Wierzbowski, Teodor.
Wilkie, William E.
Windler, Christian.
Wodka, Josef.

Wojtyska, Henryk Damien.
Württemberg, duke of, see Cristoforo, duke of Württemberg.
Xinti, Antonio.
Yildirim, Onur.
Zaccaria, Benedictine.
Zaccaria, Antonio Maria, see Antonio Maria Zaccaria, saint.
Zaccaria, Raffaella.
Zaggia, Massimo.
Zakar, Polykarp.
Zambeccari, Pompeo.
Zambelli, Paola.
Zanardi, Zita.
Zanetti, Agostino.
Zannettini, Dionigi, known as Grechetto.
Zápolyai, Giovanni, see Giovanni Zápolyai, king of Hungary.
Zapperi, Roberto.
Zardin, Danilo.
Zarri, Gabriella.
Zefirino, pope (198-217), saint.
Ziletti, Giordano.
Zorzi, Marino.
Zuliani, Federico.
Zunckel, Julia.
Zúñiga, Juan de.
Zúñiga, Luis de, see Requesens y Zúñiga, Luis de.
Zwierlein, Cornel.

Illustrations

1. Girolamo Siciolante, *Portrait of Pope Julius III*, oil on canvas, c. 1553.

2. Giacomo and Tommaso Cassignola, *Pope Paul IV*, marble, 1567.

SENTENTIA

Sanctissimi D. N. D.
Pij diuina prouí-
dentia Papæ
. IIII.

Lata in fauorẽ Illustriss.
& Rᵐⁱ D. Ioannis Cardinalis Moroni Sub
Die Sexta mensis Martij. M. D. LX.

3-4. Frontispiece of the judgment of acquittal, with Giovanni Morone's coat of arms drawn on the reverse: a mulberry tree (*moro*) on a silver field.

5. Medal commissioned by Giovanni Morone to commemorate his acquittal in 1560.

6. Bartolomeo Passarotti, *Portrait of Pope Pius V*, oil on canvas, c. 1567.

7. Bartolomeo Passarotti, *Portrait of Pope Gregory XIII*, oil on canvas, 1572-75.

8. Bernardo Castello, *The Doge of Genoa Giacomo Durazzo Welcomes Cardinal Giovanni Morone, Who Arrived at the Port of Genoa in 1575 to Pacify the City*, fresco, c. 1600.

9. Scipione Pulzone, *Portrait of Giovanni Morone*, oil on canvas, c. 1579.

The Book

Heretic or savior of the Church? The extraordinary life of a forgotten protagonist of sixteenth-century political and religious history.

Giovanni Morone (1509-80) led an apparently paradoxical life. Twice papal legate to the Council of Trent - which he brought to a close in 1563, saving it from the failure to which it seemed doomed - he became the target of grave accusations of heresy that led to two inquisitorial trials ordered by the inquisitor-popes of his age, Paul IV (who confined him in Castel Sant'Angelo for more than two years) and Pius V. Only the esteem and support of the Habsburg sovereigns - Philip II of Spain and Emperor Ferdinand I - enabled him to escape condemnation and once again take the reins of the major events of his time, from the alliance that led to the Battle of Lepanto to the crisis of the Republic of Genoa. An unrivaled diplomat formed in Sforza Milan, a leading figure in the religious colloquies of Germany shaken by Luther, a friend of Vittoria Colonna and patron of Michelangelo, and a reforming bishop, Morone was a man of immense European prestige. Yet his memory has been recast solely in the image of an exemplary Catholic prelate, erasing the dramatic conflicts within the ecclesiastical hierarchy that marked his life and played a decisive role in shaping the identity of the Catholic Church during the long age of the Counter-Reformation.

Giovanni Morone's story is a paradoxical one. He served as papal legate both at the first, failed convocation of the Council of Trent in 1542-43 and at its final phase in 1562-63, when Hubert Jedin, the foremost modern historian of the council, credited him with saving it from the failure to which it now seemed destined. Between those two convocations, however, he became the target of grave accusations of heresy, which culminated in an inquisitorial trial secretly prepared for years by Gian Pietro Carafa and formally opened in June 1555, immediately after Carafa's election as pope. The proceedings became public two years later with the sensational arrest of "so great a cardinal, [...] widely expected to become pope," as Henry II of France put it. Only the death of the inquisitor-pope allowed Morone to escape condemnation. And only the support of King Philip II of Spain enabled him to leave Castel Sant'Angelo after twenty-seven months of imprisonment and take part in the conclave that elected Pius IV, his friend and fellow Milanese, who a few weeks later, in early March 1560, pronounced his acquittal. The paradox surrounding this illustrious cardinal - whose historical and historiographical profile has alternately faded into the image of a heretic or of a "bulwark of the Catholic faith" - would persist in the years that followed, as shown by the reopening of the case prepared (though never carried out) by another inquisitor-pope, Pius V.

This book finally reconstructs a clear and coherent portrait of a historical figure of extraordinary stature.

The Authors

MASSIMO FIRPO, a member of the Accademia dei Lincei, taught Early Modern History at the Universities of Cagliari and Turin and at the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa. His research has focused chiefly on the religious and cultural history of the sixteenth century, with particular attention to the Italian Reformation, radical heresies, and the links between religious life and artistic production. For Einaudi he edited Juan de Valdés's The Christian Alphabet (1994) and published The Frescoes of Pontormo at San Lorenzo: Heresy, Politics, and Culture in the Florence of Cosimo I (1997).

GERMANO MAIFREDA, teaches Economic History at the University of Milan. His research on the early modern period focuses mainly on the formation of economic knowledge, religious minorities, and the administrative and financial dimensions of ecclesiastical tribunals. With Einaudi he published The Inquisitor's Money: Business and the Justice of Faith in Early Modern Italy (2014).

By the Same Authors

Massimo Firpo
The Frescoes of Pontormo at San Lorenzo

Germano Maifreda
The Inquisitor's Money

© 2019 Giulio Einaudi editore s.p.a., Turin
Cover: Bartolomeo Cancellieri, *Portrait of Cardinal Giovanni Morone*, oil on canvas, 1545-50. Private collection.

This ebook contains material protected by copyright and may not be copied, reproduced, transferred, distributed, rented, licensed, publicly transmitted, or used in any other way except as specifically authorized by the publisher under the terms and conditions on which it was purchased or as expressly permitted by applicable law. Any unauthorized distribution or use of this text, as well as any alteration of the electronic rights-management information, constitutes an infringement of the rights of the publisher and the author and will be subject to civil and criminal penalties under Law 633/1941, as amended.

This ebook may not under any circumstances be exchanged, traded, loaned, resold, purchased in installments, or otherwise distributed without the publisher's prior written consent. Where consent is granted, the ebook may not be made available in any form other than that in which the work was published, and the present conditions must also be imposed on any subsequent user.

www.einaudi.it
Ebook ISBN 9788858431290